

against the enactment of House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

5448. By Mr. TEMPLE: Petition of California Chamber of Commerce, California, Pa., protesting against the enactment of Senate bill 1752 or any other measure which would prohibit the printing and selling of stamped envelopes by the Government; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

5449. Also, petition of Fredericktown Coal & Coke Co., Fredericktown, Pa., protesting against the enactment of Senate bill 1752, which would prohibit the printing and selling of stamped envelopes by the Government; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

5450. By Mr. WEAVER: Petition from citizens of Buncombe County, N. C., in regard to the Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

5451. By Mr. WOODRUM: Memorial of Patriotic Sons of America of Montgomery County, Va., in behalf of legislation for restricted immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

SENATE

FRIDAY, March 16, 1928

The Chaplain, Rev. Z. Barney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, who hast committed to us the swift and solemn trust of life, since we know not what a day may bring forth, but only that the hour for serving Thee is always present, may we wake to the instant claims of Thy holy will, not waiting for to-morrow, but yielding ourselves to-day. Consecrate with Thy presence the way our feet may go, and the humblest work will shine and the roughest place be made plain. Let Thy fatherly goodness be upon all Thy children; and do Thou remember in loving pity all who are destitute and homeless, whose burdens Thou hast called on us to share. Though they be troubled and distressed on every side, save them from the anguish of despair and suffer them not to fall from Thee. Grant this, O Lord, through Him whom Thou hast sent to bear our griefs and carry our sorrows, Jesus Christ, Thy Son, our Lord.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of Wednesday last, when, on request of Mr. CURTIS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. HALTIGAN, one of its clerks, announced that the House had concurred in the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 12) appointing a committee to represent Congress at the exercises at Atlanta, Ga., incident to the unveiling of a portion of the Stone Mountain monument.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 2569. An act providing for horticultural experiment and demonstration work in the semiarid or dry-land regions of the United States; and

S. 3292. An act providing for turning over to the Ohio State Archaeological and Historical Society two dedication stones formerly a part of one of the locks of the Ohio & Erie Canal.

PRESIDENT'S LETTER TO GOVERNOR OF PORTO RICO

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the letter appearing in the morning papers from the President to the Governor of Porto Rico.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The text of President Coolidge's letter to the Governor of Porto Rico was as follows:

[From the New York Times, Friday, March 16, 1928]

Hon. HORACE M. TOWNER,

Governor of Porto Rico, San Juan, P. R.

DEAR GOVERNOR: I desire to acknowledge the concurrent resolution of the Legislature of Porto Rico committed to Colonel Lindbergh on his visit to San Juan, and also a cablegram, dated January 19, signed by Messrs. Barcelo and Tous Soto, the president of the Senate and speaker of the House of Representatives of Porto Rico, respectively.

The cablegram and resolution seem to be based largely on a complete misunderstanding of concrete facts. It would not be difficult to show that the present status of Porto Rico is far more liberal than any status of its entire history; that its people have greater control of their own affairs with less interference from without; that its people enjoy liberty and the protection of law, and that its people and its

Government are receiving material assistance through its association with the continental United States. The treaty of Paris, of course, contains no promise to the people of Porto Rico. No phrase of that treaty contemplated the extension to Porto Rico of a more liberal régime than existed. The United States has made no promise to the people of Porto Rico that has not been fulfilled, nor has any representative or spokesman for the United States made such a promise.

OUR OWN STATES NOT SO FREE

The Porto Rican government at present exercises a greater degree of sovereignty over its own internal affairs than does the government of any State or Territory of the United States. Without admitting the existence of "a grave economical situation" in the finances of the government of Porto Rico, the present difficulty, which it is hoped is but temporary, is exclusively the result of the exercise by the elected representatives of the people of Porto Rico of an authority granted by the present very liberal organic law. The responsibility of the United States, as distinguished from that of Porto Rico, is, at most, that officers appointed by the President into Porto Rico may not have exercised power legally placed in their hands to veto or make ineffective acts of the Porto Rican Legislature.

The cablegram complains that—

"Ours is the only Spanish-American country whose voice has not been heard at Habana during the Pan-American Conference, for it was not represented there."

This is a most serious error and is based on a fundamental misunderstanding of the relation of Porto Rico to the United States. No State or Territory of the Union was represented as such at Habana, but the representation of the United States in Habana represents Porto Rico as truly as it represents any part of the territory of the United States.

PEOPLE HAVE FULL CITIZENSHIP

The request is made that Porto Rico be constituted as a "free State," and not "a mere subjected colony." Certainly giving Porto Rico greater liberty than it has ever enjoyed and powers of government for the exercise of which its people are barely prepared can not, with propriety, be said to be establishing therein "a mere subjected colony." The people of Porto Rico are citizens of the United States, with all the rights and privileges of other citizens of the United States, and these privileges are those which we invoked "when declaring for independence at the memorable convention at Philadelphia."

In answering the cablegram it might be well to consider briefly the conditions and tendencies we found in Porto Rico and what the situation in Porto Rico is to-day as well as the steps we are responsible for in Porto Rico to better conditions as we found them and as they exist to-day.

There is no conflict of opinion as to the condition in which we found Porto Rico. Perhaps the best authority on local conditions was Dr. Cayetano Coll y Toste, who, in an article published in Porto Rico in 1897, after describing the progress in Porto Rico for 100 years ending with that year, thus describes the great body of the population of Porto Rico:

"Only the laborer, the son of our fields, one of the most unfortunate beings in the world, with a pale face, bare feet, lean body, ragged clothing, and feverish look, walks indifferently, with the shadows of ignorance in his eyes, dreaming of the cockfights, the shuffle of the cards, or the prize in the provincial lottery. No, it is not possible that the tropical zone produces such organic anemia; this lethargy of body and soul is the offspring of moral and physical vices that drag down the spirit and lead our peasants to such a state of social degradation. In the miserable cabin, hung on a peak like a swallow's nest, this unhappy little creature comes into the world; when it opens its eyes to the light of reason it does not hear the village bell reminding him to lift his soul to the Divine One and render homage to the Creator of Worlds; he hears only the hoarse cry of the cock crowing in the early morning, and then he longs for the coming of Sunday to witness the strife and knavery of the cockfights. When a man, he takes up with the first woman to be found in the neighborhood and makes her his mistress to gratify his amorous lusts. In the wretched tavern the food he finds is only the putrid salt meat, codfish filled with rotten red spots, and India rice, and the man who harvests the best coffee in the world, who helps to gather into the troughs the sweetest grains of nature, and takes to pasture in the fields and meadows the beautiful calves, can not raise to his lips the bit of meat, because the municipal tax places it out of his reach and almost duplicates the price of the tainted codfish; coffee becomes to him an article of luxury through its high price, and of sugar he can only taste that filled with molasses and impurities. * * * This eternal groan of the Porto Rican laborers is an infirmity of our present-day society and consequently it is necessary to study it and remedy it."

That the accuracy of this description was appreciated in Porto Rico was evidenced by the fact that it was awarded a prize from the Economic Society of Friends of the Country.

Other contemporary testimony of prominent Porto Ricans to the same general effect is not lacking, but space forbids its inclusion.

CONDITION OF LONG STANDING

Were this pitiable economic condition the result of a passing depression the situation would have been less hopeless, but the evidence is clear that the condition was one of long standing and that the tendency was to get worse rather than to improve. One would look in vain for a single ray of hope if Porto Rico were to continue its normal course as we found it. Health and sanitation, education and public works, were such as naturally accompanied the situation of the people pictured.

Prior to the American occupation the Porto Rican people had received practically no training in self-government or the free exercise of the franchise. While there existed a body of educated, intelligent men, the great mass of the people were without experience or training in self-government, and only a small percentage could qualify as voters under very broad electoral qualifications.

The military government in its brief existence of 18 months accomplished the following:

1. Order was reestablished and an insular police force organized.
2. The more obvious burdens of taxation as they fell on the very poor people were abolished, and a careful study made by an expert preparatory to the adoption of a proper revenue system for the island.
3. Such changes in the judicial system were made as were necessary to bring that system more in accordance with American procedure and with the American view of individual rights and liberty.
4. A department of education was established; boards of health were organized; the public works were reorganized and progress in road building was greater than in all the previous history of Porto Rico.

And finally the government was reorganized in accordance with the act passed by Congress to establish a civil government in order that there might be a minimum of friction in changing from the military to the civil government.

Experience has shown that this organic act, though intended to be temporary, was quite up to the standard of such acts, and that it gave to the people of Porto Rico a liberal form of government under which they could acquire experience in democratic government honestly administered and could enjoy all of the rights and privileges to which we are accustomed. Under it the possibility of development was great, and this possibility was realized.

THE PRESENT STATUS OF PORTO RICO

Congress, recognizing the progress in Porto Rico, enacted in 1917 the present organic law. Under this law the Porto Rican people were made citizens of the United States. All of the guarantees of the Constitution are extended to Porto Rico, or the Legislature of Porto Rico is granted authority to make effective those guarantees not specifically extended.

The great satisfaction in Porto Rico at the passage of this act is the best evidence of its liberality.

The principal difference between the government of Porto Rico and that of the organized and incorporated Territories of the United States is the greater power of the legislature and the fiscal provisions governing Porto Rico, which are far more liberal than those of any of our States or Territories.

GOVERNMENT FINANCES

Through the urging of the War Department, the United States income tax of 1913 was extended to Porto Rico, with a provision authorizing the modification of the law by the local legislature and directing that the income from this source go into the insular treasury.

In the revision of the organic act of Porto Rico in 1917, the War Department, with the assistance of the governor, was enabled to secure a provision similar to the one in effect in the Philippine Islands; that is, that the internal revenue collected in the United States on Porto Rican products should be turned in to the treasury of Porto Rico. These two taxes are now carried in the returns of the revenues of Porto Rico as "United States internal revenues" and "income taxes," and together they constitute a good part of the revenues of the government.

The treasury of Porto Rico receives the customs duties collected in Porto Rico, less the cost of collection. It receives the internal-revenue taxes which are laid by its own legislature and collected in Porto Rico. It receives the income taxes which are laid by its own legislature. It receives the internal-revenue taxes collected in the United States on Porto Rican products consumed in the United States.

I have set down a few scattered facts, which, however, sufficiently show the consequences of Porto Rico's union with the United States. We found the people of Porto Rico poor and distressed, without hope for the future, ignorant, poverty-stricken, and diseased, not knowing what constituted a free and democratic government and without the experience of having participated in any government. We have progressed in the relief of poverty and distress, in the eradication of disease, and have attempted, with some success, to inculcate in the inhabitants the basic ideas of a free, democratic government. We have now in Porto Rico a government in which the participation by Ameri-

cans from the United States is indeed small. We have given to the Porto Rican practically every right and privilege which we permitted ourselves to exercise. We have now progressed to the point where discouragement is replaced by hope, and while only 30 years ago one was indeed an optimist to see anything promising in Porto Rico, to-day one is indeed a pessimist who can see any reasonable human ambition beyond the horizon of its people.

PORTO RICANS AID IN PROGRESS

It is not desired to leave the impression that all progress in Porto Rico was due to continental Americans. Without the cooperation and assistance of Porto Ricans progress would indeed have been negligible, but the cooperation is largely due to the encouragement of American assistance, American methods, and an increase in the reward of efforts made.

There has been a natural hesitation to recall and dwell upon the unfortunate condition of Porto Rico in the past. There is a feeling, however, that the United States is entitled to a good name in its dealing with Porto Rico and to protect itself from any reflection on its good name. Perhaps no territory in the world has received such considerate treatment in the past 30 years as has Porto Rico, and perhaps nowhere else has progress been so marked and so apparent as in Porto Rico. We are certainly entitled to a large part of the credit for this situation.

There exists to-day in Porto Rico a department of health in all respects modern and including in its activities all branches of modern public-health work. Not of least importance as showing the marked progress in health matters in Porto Rico in recent years is the fact that it is completely manned by Porto Ricans. The improvement in the health conditions of Porto Rico is not fully indicated by the reduction in death rate alone, though this rate had been almost divided by two since the early days of American sovereignty of the island. The practical eradication of smallpox, which had existed continuously in the island for more than 40 years and which had resulted in more than 600 deaths annually for the last 10 years prior to American sovereignty; the diagnosis of the so-called tropical "anemia" which affected the great bulk of the population of Porto Rico; the discoveries in Cuba in the method of propagating yellow fever, were concrete benefits to the health situation in Porto Rico and have been of continuous benefit.

EDUCATION AND HEALTH

The history of education in Porto Rico prior to its occupation by the United States is very largely the history of individual effort. Individuals of character and determination would establish and conduct a school, and it would generally disappear with the persons establishing it. Governmental efforts likewise lacked continuity. About the year 1860 a more determined governmental effort was made, and in 1898 the maximum enrollment in the public schools and private schools was 29,182, which has increased to 213,321. The per capita expenditure for public education in Porto Rico has increased during the period of American sovereignty from 30 cents per annum to approximately \$4 per annum. The number of government-owned public-school buildings has increased from none to 991. The Department of Health and the Department of Education of Porto Rico are combining to make of the Porto Ricans of the future a different type physically and mentally from those we found in Porto Rico.

Not because they are entitled to first consideration, but because they are so readily measured and would be of fundamental importance in any change of status, it may be well briefly to recall some of the direct financial advantages to Porto Rico accruing from its relation to the United States.

Porto Rico pays no tax to the United States Treasury. The Federal services in Porto Rico are supported from the United States Treasury.

The services which benefit directly and financially the people of Porto Rico are the Lighthouse Service, the agricultural experiment station, and financial assistance to the College of Agriculture, the maintenance of the Porto Rico Regiment of the Army, the activities of the Veterans' Bureau, and Federal participation in harbor improvements. In a more general way, Porto Rico receives the protection of the Army and Navy and the service of the Department of State and its diplomatic and consular service.

\$5,000,000 EXPENDED ANNUALLY

The expenditure from the United States accruing directly to the people of Porto Rico is not less than \$5,000,000 per annum.

In the fiscal year 1927 the total operating revenue of Porto Rico was \$11,191,893.11. Of this total the following, in our States and Territories, would not accrue to the local treasury:

Customs.....	\$1,806,567.91
Income taxes.....	1,565,745.98
United States internal revenue.....	440,660.71
Total.....	3,812,974.60
Excise taxes (which would in great part not accrue to local treasury).....	5,701,502.33
Total.....	9,514,466.93

It will be observed, therefore, that had we not given special and very considerate attention to its needs, but had treated Porto Rico as we have treated the incorporated Territory of the United States, of the more than \$11,000,000 subject to appropriation by the elected Legislature of Porto Rico there would have been not to exceed \$2,000,000 available.

The United States tariff extends to Porto Rico, and no part—certainly no agricultural part—of our territory is so favored by its tariff. And the striking development of Porto Rico under American sovereignty as shown by the growth of imports and exports is, in a material part, due to this favorable tariff treatment of its products.

INCREASED EXPORTS

The total exports from Porto Rico in the last complete years of Spanish sovereignty were \$11,555,962. In the fiscal year 1927 this total was \$108,067,434. The total imports in the last Spanish year were \$10,725,563, and in 1927 were \$98,810,750.

Comparing this with one of the most prosperous, wholly independent neighbors of Porto Rico, we find that in the period in which the exterior trade of Porto Rico has been multiplied by nine that of its neighbor has been multiplied by less than seven.

The total value of Porto Rican products shipped to the United States in the fiscal year was \$97,823,523, and of this total \$97,000,000 was highly protected in the American market. The total purchase by Porto Rico in the markets of the United States in the same calendar year was \$87,046,319. For a number of years Cuba has been the largest purchaser of Porto Rican coffee, which is given a 20 per cent reduction of the Cuban tariff as an American product, not because Cuba sells to Porto Rico but because Cuba sells to the United States.

The advantage of the United States market to Porto Rico can the better be appreciated when it is noted that of the \$97,000,000 of Porto Rican products sold in the last calendar year into the United States there would have been imposed, had these products come from countries not enjoying free admission into the United States, a duty of approximately \$57,000,000.

On the products from the continental United States entering Porto Rico during the same period the duty imposed, had they come from a foreign country, would have been less than one-third of this amount. Certainly Porto Rico would not desire reciprocity to be more favorable to it.

The bonded indebtedness of Porto Rico is \$25,555,000, and that of the municipalities of Porto Rico \$18,772,000. These bonds are practically all held in the United States. Due to the fact that these bonds are tax exempt by a United States statute, Porto Rico pays in annual interest at least 2 per cent less than would otherwise be paid—a saving of approximately \$886,540 annually.

GREATER AUTONOMY OF NO USE

In what way, by a greater grant of autonomy, could Porto Rico so look after the market for its products or the market for its bonds, or in what way could it improve the economic position of its government or its people?

In studying the effect of granting to Porto Rico what was requested in the cablegram sent to me, one must naturally begin with the assumption that the products of Porto Rico would be for some time approximately what they now are. The change would be in disposing of them. In the year 1926 Porto Rico sold in the United States market 1,157,000,000 pounds of sugar and received therefor \$48,200,000. A near neighbor sold an equal quantity of sugar for \$22,800,000. Porto Rico sold in the United States in the same year 20,500,000 pounds of leaf tobacco for \$13,000,000. Its neighbor sold an equal quantity of leaf tobacco for \$1,192,000. In the sale of tobacco the element of quality enters, but these numbers sufficiently show the effect of the free entry to the United States market on the two principal products of the island, and show the extent to which the funds now used to make its purchases abroad and to meet its indebtedness abroad would shrink if the privilege were withdrawn. This shrinkage must be followed by a corresponding shrinkage in the revenues that go to support the activities in Porto Rico which mean progress for the future.

There is no disposition in America, and certainly not on my part, to discourage any reasonable aspiration of the people of Porto Rico. The island has so improved and its people have so progressed in the last generation as to justify high hopes for the future; but it certainly is not unreasonable to ask that those who speak for Porto Rico limit their petition to those things which may be granted without a denial of such hope. Nor is it unreasonable to suggest that the people of Porto Rico, who are a part of the people of the United States, will progress with the people of the United States rather than isolated from the source from which they have received practically their only hope of progress.

Sincerely yours,

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

FEBRUARY 28, 1928.

MUSCLE SHOALS

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I realize that without unanimous consent during the morning hour I would not be allowed to speak. I would like to proceed for a few moments. I am

not going to talk more than five or six minutes, I think, and I would like to do so at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator from Nebraska will proceed.

Mr. NORRIS. During the debate on the Muscle Shoals proposition I called attention at one time to a telegram which I had received from Athens, Ala., stating that if the joint resolution which was then pending were passed and became a law, Athens would build a transmission line to Muscle Shoals. My attention has been called to the fact by a citizen of Athens that there is now pending before the people of Athens a proposition to sell their municipal plant to the Alabama Power Co., and this citizen of Athens, Miss Susan Lawrence Davis, a voter there and a resident of Athens, who has lived there for a great many years, sends to me a letter, which I hold in my hand, written to her by the attorney of the Alabama Power Co.

It is a very fine letter; but I submitted it this morning to an expert, and he tells me it is a mimeographed letter, that the only thing in the letter written directly by the typewriter is her name and address. It is signed with pen and ink by W. T. Saunders, a member of the law firm of Saunders & Woodruff, of Athens, Ala. So I assume that this letter has been sent to all the citizens and voters of Athens. I want to read a little of it, in which the attorney for the company sets out so patriotically his interest in Athens and how that is subservient and secondary to his duty as an attorney for the Alabama Power Co. He said:

DEAR MISS DAVIS: On Monday, March 26, the qualified voters of Athens will be asked to express with their ballot a choice between retaining the lighting plant and distribution system or disposing of them to the Alabama Power Co. for a consideration of \$113,000. (The water system is not included.)

First, I want to make clear my position in the matter. I am the regularly retained legal counsel for the power company, but in selling my legal services I did not relinquish any of my citizenship ties. I am now as much interested in the welfare and progress of the community I love and in which I first saw the light of day as I was before becoming connected with those who would purchase the property. Too, my personal holdings and those of my family are at stake, and as self-preservation is the first law of nature I naturally would not advocate the sale of the power plant if I honestly believed that to do so would in any way work a hardship on my community and jeopardize the enhancement in value of my family's interests. My interest and my family's interest in Athens are far more important to my future happiness and welfare than my professional connection with any single client, and I say this without the slightest attempt to belittle or in any degree reflect upon those I serve in a legal capacity.

Having thus established his patriotism and his interest, which are above everything else, in the beautiful city of Athens, he then proceeds for about four or five pages of typewritten matter to make an argument in favor of his client, the Alabama Power Co., trying to induce the recipients of the letter to cast their votes in favor of the Alabama Power Co.

Mr. President, I wonder if intelligent citizens and voters of that beautiful city in northern Alabama will be fooled by any bunk of this kind. The question as to whether they should sell or not sell their lighting plant and distribution system is one that I do not presume to decide or even to express an opinion upon. It is for them to determine. I have no knowledge of the local conditions and have no advice to give. But this attempt of the Alabama Power Co. to get the property is only a sample of what is going on all over the Nation. An attorney is employed. Perhaps this attorney may be employed for other reasons; I am not saying that; but an attorney influential in political matters, in financial matters, in social matters, is employed for his legal ability and for his ability to persuade people in political matters. Here is a lawyer devoting his time to sending out a letter of this kind, I presume to every citizen and voter of that city, which must cost quite a sum of money, who first tells the voters that he is not moved by his legal employment but that he is moved entirely by his hope and his wish for the welfare of the people in that community, whom he so dearly loves according to the dollars and cents that he as an attorney at law gets from the Alabama Power Co.

Mr. President, I have no criticism to offer against the attorney who accepts as a client any corporation, none whatever against anyone who sells his legal services to the Alabama Power Co. or any other power company or any other corporation. But the attorney who, under the pretense of selling his legal services, accepts the fee and the pay to advance the political interests of his client and to control the politics of his community is selling his birthright for a mess of pottage.

We have a good deal to say against the man who sells his vote. It is a despicable thing. Such a man ought to be deprived of the right ever to cast a ballot. But we do not hear much said against the influential lawyer, the influential attor-

ney, who, under the guise of selling his legal services, sells his duty as a citizen and tries to control through that method the rights and the duties of his fellow men.

Mr. President, right along the same line I received another letter from the superintendent of the municipal water works at Springfield, Ill. I want to read a paragraph from that letter and then a paragraph or two from a copy of a letter which he incloses. I had quoted in the debate here on Muscle Shoals something from the report of the municipal waterworks in Springfield, Ill. I stated then that the report from which I quoted was nearly a year old, but that I had seen a later report which was practically, or, I think, exactly the same. The superintendent of the waterworks in this letter calls my attention to what might be a criticism of what I have said, and I want to read that. He writes:

As to the comparisons of rates shown in our report and used by you, it is possible that some one will take issue with you and say they are not true. As a matter of fact, the Illinois Power & Light Corporation, one of the Insull group of utilities, has recently made a reduction in rates in the city of Decatur, and possibly in some other towns, on account of the example being set in Springfield. In Decatur a movement is now under way to establish a municipal plant, and about the middle of last summer this new rate was promulgated; however, I wish to say that we checked the rates in the cities used for comparison just before the report went to press. We will do likewise before our next report goes to press, which will be in about three months.

Among other things, the writer of this letter inclosed a copy of the letter which he has written to a friend of his about the newspaper situation, in which he said:

A newspaper adjunct to the electric light and power monopoly has been rapidly developing during the past two months and has, so far, reached some fifteen to twenty million dollars in magnitude. The movement is headed by Ira C. Copley, who testified before the Reed committee on campaign expenditures Wednesday, August 4, 1926, at Chicago. His testimony will be found at page 1805 in part 2 of "Senatorial campaign expenditures," pursuant to Senate Resolution 195, Sixty-ninth Congress, first session. Copley was the owner of 77 per cent of the stock of the Western United Gas & Electric Co., a utility corporation the principal service of which being electric light and power and gas, and its territory being principally in McHenry and Will Counties in northern Illinois, where about 15 cities and towns were supplied.

In addition to these utilities, Copley owned three leading newspapers circulating in the same territory, namely, the Aurora Beacon News, the Elgin Courier News, and the Joliet Herald News. These papers were used to nurse along the people and keep them contented while Copley became immensely wealthy by collecting exorbitant rates for utility service.

Further on he says:

He still owns the newspapers and has acquired some 10 or 15 others, usually paying handsome prices. His utility properties, however, have all been transferred to the Samuel Insull group.

It seems from this letter that this man is engaged in the newspaper business about as the Water Power Trust and the Electric Light Trust are engaged in buying up, wherever they can get possession and control, local companies which are owned by the municipalities supplying electricity to citizens. Further on he says:

Some two months ago he closed a deal for the Illinois State Journal of this city—

That is, Springfield, Ill.—

at a price of \$900,000, which is fully \$300,000 more than the property is commercially worth. A week or two later he acquired the Union and the Tribune of San Diego, owned by the Spreckels family, for which it is reported, he paid three million. He also purchased the Independent, a radical paper, which he suppressed entirely, having dismantled the plant. A few days after this he purchased a number of newspapers known as the Fred Kellogg chain—some 12 or 15 in number—and, I am informed, negotiations were under way for the purchase of the Express, one of the large papers of Los Angeles. It is rumored that this chain is to be extended up the coast, including the cities of Oakland, San Francisco, Seattle, and Tacoma. Bear in mind that this is the area in which the utility fight is the keenest! Observers in southern California are convinced that this is merely a defense measure on the part of the utility interests who are providing the funds for these purchases and thereby occupying the newspaper field to shut out possible newspaper support from the public side.

Copley is trying to make it appear that he is out of the utility business, which is absolutely untrue. You will see by reading his testimony, beginning at page 1805, that he admitted to the Reed committee that, for the most part, he received in exchange for his utility property shares in the Insull properties, and, incidentally, he confessed to having contributed \$25,000 to the Smith campaign fund. When he came to

Springfield I was introduced to him as being at the head of the municipal utilities of this city. I shook hands with him, saying, "And you also are in the utility business." He promptly replied, "No; I sold out." "But," said I, "you are still interested in utilities." "Well, yes," he said, "I took securities in payment for my property." Yet, a few days later, when he purchased the San Diego Union and the Tribune, he states over his own signature as follows: "These papers will not be the personal organs of myself or anyone else. I have no political ambitions. I have no connections with any public utility anywhere and no connections with any other business than the newspaper business anywhere." Yet at this very time he was still carrying the title of president in the reorganized Western United Gas & Electric Co., which, I understand, has become a Samuel Insull subsidiary.

How far this newspaper monopoly will go nobody knows; but it is, indeed, a menace, and an investigation which would show the actual financial support behind this venture would undoubtedly reveal a direct utility connection, and would be a splendid and far-reaching contribution toward the protection of the public.

I respectfully refer these particular matters to which I have referred, as to Alabama, as to Illinois and California, and as to Copley, to the Federal Trade Commission for proper investigation under the resolution which some time ago was adopted by the Senate.

ED LOCKE, NIGHT WATCHMAN

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, if I may have just a moment, I desire to say that a day or two ago, on March 14, in fact, Robert Quillen, on the editorial page of the Washington Post, had this to say:

Brains alone deserve respect now—whether in an old head or a young one.

In sharp contrast with that strange and wicked philosophy I wish to read from the Washington News of the same day, March 14, a dispatch from Los Angeles, Calif.:

Ed Locke, night watchman at a switching station at the South California Edison Co., 8 miles from Saugus, hung valiantly to a telephone shouting a warning to those in the valley below. Hours later his body was found. He had stood by his post.

In this day of materialism, of corruption in politics, selfishness, and cowardice on the part of many public men it is refreshing to have brought to our attention the deed of a heroic spirit like this young man Locke. I do not know how brainy he was, but he had a principle and a love of humanity in his heart worth more than gold. He gave his life to save the lives of others. But Mr. Quillen says that "Brains only deserve respect now." I should like to suggest to this gentleman, whose writings consist of plagiarisms from Emerson, Macaulay, Carlyle, and Fields Scrap Book, the thought that there is something worth more than brilliant brains. It is well to have good sense. Mr. Lincoln said the reason God made so many of the plain people with good sound, common sense was that he loved them most. Hickman, the human fiend, had an extraordinary brain. The teachers of his early youth refer to his remarkable intellect, but he is a moral pervert and a criminal, and must go to his death for crimes against God and man before he reaches manhood's estate. Quillen and such writers of the modern day who peddle out such false philosophy ought to be condemned by all respectable people.

Mr. President, it is a noble thing to pay tribute to a man or woman of extraordinary brain power, but I submit that there are human virtues that tower in their worth to mankind above brilliance of intellect. Bacon was referred to as the "wisest, brightest, and meanest of mankind." The late Senator Hoar, of Massachusetts, once delivered an able and eloquent address to a graduating class of young men in which he said to them, "In all your struggles of life, in storing your mind with valuable information, in training your intellect, remember in it all and through it all that mankind is the bottom fact."

Another has said, "The man who loves his fireside best is the nation's best patriot." It is not necessary that he be a man of tremendous brain power, but the man who loves his fireside best loves those dependent upon him; is a blessing to his country and a blessing to humanity.

So we find that the deed of Ed Locke in the estimation of some, if not in the estimation of Robert Quillen, is highly prized by those who love and honor him for the noble and admirable virtues displayed by him in giving his life to save the lives of others.

Again the Bible tells us that "A good name is rather to be chosen than great riches, and loving favor rather than silver and gold." So the man who strives to have a good name is entitled to "respect."

Again, Alexander Pope has said, "An honest man's the noblest work of God." Then, certainly, an honest man is en-

titled to "respect." And the Scripture says: "What shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul?"

So, Mr. President, it is not only necessary to study and cultivate the intellect and make it as capable as it is possible to make it, but it is absolutely essential to possess noble heart qualities and be grounded in right principles. These make up the strength and lasting qualities of the Nation. An unscrupulous and unprincipled smart man is an undesirable and dangerous citizen.

So brains, unless they are backed by a love of right principles and an innate desire and purpose to be fair and just in all the relations of life, are not entitled to very much "respect." The point I want to make, Mr. President, is that this young man, Locke, who sat at that telephone in California, with the water roaring down the valley behind him, when he knew certain death was coming to him, was as great a hero as ever died on the battle field. No higher example of devotion to duty and superb valor and heroism has come to my notice. This young man possessed the highest of human qualities. He gave his life to save the lives of others. He died nobly and heroically serving his fellow man.

Mr. President, if the writers in the periodicals of our day would do more to foster and exalt human virtue rather than to praise brilliant intellects that use their power to spread evil doctrines and wrong principles, the country would be better off.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I ask for the regular order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Petitions and memorials are in order. First, the Chair lays before the Senate an Executive communication.

WORKHOUSE AND REFORMATORY, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA (S. DOC. NO. 72)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation affecting estimates of appropriations, fiscal year 1929, for the workhouse and reformatory, District of Columbia, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a telegram from the secretary of the Senate of the State of Iowa, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Telegram]

DES MOINES, IOWA, March 15, 1928.

Hon. CHARLES G. DAWES,

Vice President of the United States, Washington, D. C.:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 9

"Be it resolved by the General Assembly of the State of Iowa—

"SECTION 1. That the Senate of the Forty-second General Assembly of Iowa, convened in extra session (the house concurring), hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States to pass at this session effective agricultural surplus control legislation as embodied in the McNary bill in the Senate and the Haugen bill in the House, each containing the equalization fee.

"SEC. 2. That a copy of this resolution shall be transmitted by wire to the President of the United States Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States and to the chairman of the Agricultural Committee of each House of Congress."

Foregoing resolution adopted by the General Assembly of Iowa in special session March 14, 1928.

WALTER H. BEAM, Secretary of Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate a telegram from the secretary of the Senate of the State of Iowa, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Telegram]

DES MOINES, IOWA, March 15, 1928.

Hon. CHARLES G. DAWES,

Vice President of the United States, Washington, D. C.:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 10

"Be it resolved by the General Assembly of the State of Iowa—

"SECTION 1. That the Senate of the Forty-second General Assembly of Iowa, convened in extra session (the house concurring), hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States to pass such legislation and make such appropriation as is necessary to continue to carry on most efficiently and effectively the work of the combatting of the European corn borer, and preventing and checking its spread throughout the agricultural areas of the United States. It is particularly urged that the appropriation for that purpose be not decreased so as to retard the fight upon this bill.

"SEC. 2. That a copy of this resolution shall be transmitted by wire to the President of the United States Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States and to the chairman of the Agricultural Committees of each House of Congress."

Foregoing resolution adopted by the General Assembly of Iowa in special session March 14, 1928.

WALTER H. BEAM, Secretary of Senate.

Mr. CAPPER presented a petition of sundry citizens of Sylvan Grove, Kans., praying for the passage of the so-called McNary-Haugen farm relief bill, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. WATERMAN presented a petition of sundry citizens of the State of Colorado, praying for the passage of legislation granting increased pensions to Civil War veterans and their widows, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. COPELAND presented petitions of sundry citizens of Utica and Brockport, N. Y., praying for the passage of legislation granting increased pensions to Civil War veterans and their widows, which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts presented letters in the nature of memorials from the Hampshire, Hampden, Franklin Beekeepers' Association; the Eastern Massachusetts Society of Beekeepers; the Worcester County Beekeepers' Society; the Department of Entomology, Massachusetts Agricultural College; Lou Lombard, resident supervisor vocational department, State Normal School; and sundry citizens, all in the State of Massachusetts, remonstrating against the passage of legislation permitting the use of corn sugar in foods without statement of contents on the labels, which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented numerous letters in the nature of memorials from sundry firms and citizens in the State of Massachusetts, remonstrating against the passage of the bill (S. 1752) to regulate the manufacture and sale of stamped envelopes, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented numerous letters in the nature of petitions from sundry firms and citizens in the State of Massachusetts, praying for the passage of the bill (H. R. 9195) to amend sections 2804 and 3402 of the Revised Statutes, relative to the importation of cigars, cheroots, and cigarettes by parcel post, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a letter in the nature of a memorial from William Smith, first vice president of the Cigar Makers' International Union of America, remonstrating against the passage of the bill (H. R. 9195) to amend sections 2804 and 3402 of the Revised Statutes, relative to the importation of cigars, cheroots, and cigarettes by parcel post, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. WILLIS, from the Committee on Territories and Insular Possessions, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 8126) to repeal the sixty-first proviso of section 6 and the last proviso of section 7 of "An act to establish the Mount McKinley National Park in the Territory of Alaska," approved February 26, 1917, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 552) thereon.

Mr. HALE, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which was referred the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 51) tendering the thanks of Congress to Commander Albert Cushing Read, United States Navy, for his achievement in completing the first trans-Atlantic airplane flight, and providing for his advancement on the list of commanders of the Navy, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 553) thereon.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

Mr. GREENE, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day the committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 2569. An act providing for horticultural experiment and demonstration work in the semiarid or dry-land regions of the United States; and

S. 3292. An act providing for turning over to the Ohio State Archaeological and Historical Society two dedication stones formerly a part of one of the locks of the Ohio & Erie Canal.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McKELLAR:

A bill (S. 3655) for the relief of Horatio S. Hubbell; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GOODING:

A bill (S. 3656) for the relief of C. M. Williamson, C. E. Liljenquist, Lottie Redman, D. R. Johnson, and H. N. Smith; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. WATSON:

A bill (S. 3658) granting an increase of pension to Robert O. Graves; and

A bill (S. 3659) granting an increase of pension to Lucy A. Van Deman; to the Committee on Pensions.

ADMISSION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I introduce a bill proposing an amendment to the immigration law, together with a brief explanation of the purpose of the amendment, and ask that it may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Immigration.

The bill (S. 3657) to amend the immigration act of 1924, as amended, in respect of nonquota immigrants, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Immigration, and, with the accompanying statement, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subdivision (a) of section 4 of the immigration act of 1924, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) An immigrant who is the unmarried child under 18 years of age, the father, the mother, or the wife, of a citizen of the United States who resides therein at the time of the filing of a petition under section 9."

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. This is an amendment to the immigration act of 1924, which proposes to admit in excess of the quota the parents of American citizens.

As the law now reads, parents of American citizens are given only a preference within the quota, which in most countries has been exhausted for many years to come. This amendment would give to parents of American citizens nonquota status and allow them to enter the country without years of waiting. It is purely a humane measure.

AMENDMENTS TO FLOOD CONTROL BILL

Mr. McKELLAR submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by him to Senate bill 3434, the flood control bill, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENTS TO MIGRATORY BIRD BILL

Mr. DILL submitted five amendments intended to be proposed by him to Senate bill 1271, the so-called migratory bird bill, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS—HANNAH NELSON LUNDGREEN

On motion of Mr. SMOOT, it was—

Ordered, That the papers filed in support of S. 1091, Sixty-seventh Congress, for the relief of Hannah Nelson Lundgreen, be withdrawn from the files of the Senate, no adverse report having been made thereon.

SALES OF FOREIGN MANUFACTURED LEATHER

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate, under the heading of resolutions coming over from the preceding day, Senate Resolution 169, submitted by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED] on March 15.

Mr. CURTIS. The Senator from Pennsylvania is not present at the moment, and I ask that the resolution may go over without prejudice.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will go over without prejudice.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

The VICE PRESIDENT. Morning business is closed. Under an order heretofore agreed to, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Thereupon the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five hours spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. CURTIS. I move that the Senate adjourn until noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, March 19, 1928, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 16, 1928

SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE

Archer Woodford, of Kentucky, to be a secretary in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

GENERAL OFFICERS

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Briant Harris Wells, from April 19, 1928, vice Maj. Gen. Ernest Hinds, to be retired from active service April 18, 1928.

To be brigadier general

Col. Peter Edward Traub, Cavalry, vice Brig. Gen. Briant H. Wells, nominated for appointment as major general.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 16, 1928

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Andrew Wiedenmann to be collector of customs district No. 8, Rochester, N. Y.

POSTMASTERS

ARIZONA

Clarence J. Wilson, Casa Grande.

COLORADO

Roy McWilliams, Ault.

CONNECTICUT

Herbert E. Erwin, New Britain.

INDIANA

Foster V. Annis, Bremen.

William G. McNeelan, Holton.

John T. Stevenson, Kirklin.

KANSAS

James B. Pratt, Syracuse.

MAINE

Harry J. White, Jonesport.

NEBRASKA

Charles W. Fritts, Crawford.

NORTH CAROLINA

McForrest Cheek, Franklinville.

Jesse W. Wood, Littleton.

PENNSYLVANIA

William A. Leroy, Canonsburg.

Edgar M. Chelgren, Grampian.

Thomas J. Kennedy, Renfrew.

TENNESSEE

Christine M. Meister, Loretto.

Joe N. Wood, Ridgely.

WASHINGTON

Mabel G. Lamm, Burlington.

WEST VIRGINIA

Edwin B. Hutchinson, Monaville.

WYOMING

John A. Stafford, Rock Springs.

REJECTION

Executive nomination rejected by the Senate March 16, 1928

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION COMMISSIONER

John Jacob Esch to be a member of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, March 16, 1928

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Jehovah Father, Thou art wisdom, Thou art love! Remember us, O Mighty One. Our hearts tremble at this petition. We would hide our souls from the dread vision of Thy holiness. Have mercy upon us; remove our transgressions from us as far as the east is from the west. With every rising sun enable us to cancel the regrets of our yesterdays and concern ourselves with our to-days, and go forward to attain. Our deepest desire is that our thoughts, words, and deeds may stand the scrutiny of the broad day and sound true in every test. Holy Spirit, be with us and guide us, that our lives may be as honest in the dark as they are in the light; as good in obscurity as they are in publicity; as faithful when alone as when all the world is looking on. May we set our affections upon the dateless and the spaceless things of Thy kingdom. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the Senate had passed the bill (S. 777)

making eligible for retirement, under certain conditions, officers and former officers of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps of the United States, other than officers of the Regular Army, Navy, or Marine Corps, who incurred physical disability in line of duty while in the service of the United States during the World War, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with an amendment a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

H. R. 4964. An act to authorize the city of Muskogee, Okla., to remove and retain title to the boilers from the Municipal Hospital Building recently conveyed by the city to the United States Veterans' Bureau No. 90, at Muskogee, Okla.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2800) entitled "An act authorizing E. K. Morse, his successors and assigns (or his or their heirs, legal representatives, and assigns), to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Delaware River at or near Burlington, N. J."

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. JONES and Mr. FLETCHER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of February 16, 1889, as amended by the act of March 2, 1895, entitled "An act to authorize and provide for the disposition of useless papers in the executive departments," for the disposition of useless papers in the Department of Commerce.

MUNICIPAL HOSPITAL, MUSKOGEE, OKLA.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4964) to authorize the city of Muskogee, Okla., to remove and retain title to the boilers from the Municipal Hospital Building recently conveyed by the city to the United States Veterans' Bureau Hospital No. 90, at Muskogee, Okla., with a Senate amendment, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 4964 and concur in the Senate amendment. The Clerk will report the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS—THE VERMONT FLOOD

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the RECORD some remarks of my own in regard to the Vermont flood.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Vermont asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in regard to the Vermont flood. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRIGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, we have heard on this floor more than one vivid portrayal of the Mississippi flood. These have aroused the interest and excited the sympathy of the entire Nation. I will tell you in brief the story of our disastrous flood of 1927. You will see that lives were lost, suffering was endured that left a record quite as grim as that in the valley of the great river that draws its waters from so many of our States.

Vermont is a comparatively small State. Its area is only 9,564 square miles. The last census recorded a population of 352,428 people scattered along the valleys and on the rugged hills that overlook them. Our property listed for taxation in 1926 was \$317,000,000, while the total estimated wealth stated in the last census report was \$842,040,000.

The autumn of 1927 was one of marvelous beauty. The weather was perfect and the verdure fresh beyond the normal period. Crops came into complete maturity. Barns and granaries were full and Vermonters looked ahead to the rigors of coming winter months with a sense of security and contentment.

Over our roads, winding here and there among the hills, passed thousands of tourists contemplating with amazement scenes of rare beauty in this Switzerland of America. Henry Ford, in referring to Vermont, recently said:

Tell me where, in this great country, is there a spot so beautiful as Vermont. The summer can not be duplicated in the world. Show me the tourist that visits the Green Mountain State, and I will show you the tourist who will continue to go to Vermont always.

In addition to the hundreds of miles of gravel-surfaced roads we had entered upon an ambitious project of building hard-sur-

facéd roads. Nearly 50 miles were completed last year. We have already expended nearly \$8,000,000 of Federal and State money on this program, building 65.1 miles of concrete, 51.4 miles of bituminous macadam, 109 miles of gravel, and 54 bridges of over 20-foot span. We have been building for what seemed to be a bright and prosperous future.

During the evening of November 2 a warm rain commenced that soon extended itself into a downpour. Lawns, gardens, and fields soon became water-soaked; pools formed in all hollows; hour after hour the rain came until in some sections 40 hours passed before there was any let-up, with a precipitation of over 8 inches of water. Small brooks became raging torrents, reaching out and sweeping everything within reach of the waters. The main streams became full, overflowed, came into the streets of prosperous valley towns, up to the front steps of the homes and business places, then into them, driving occupants out or into the second stories; the mad waters pounded down their courses against dams and narrow passes like demons bent on destruction of everything within reach. Bridges were carried away, 1,258 of them; trees torn up by their roots; houses demolished; whole sections of villages disappearing; acres of land washed away and farms ruined; herds of valuable cattle drowned; houses, with all occupants, swallowed up. House after house, with all equipment—stoves, furnaces, furniture—go down White River in a wild, raging torrent that rises, at Gayville, not 10 or 20 feet but a hundred feet, and not a brick or a splinter has ever been found. Great gullies suddenly appeared, in some cases a hundred feet deep, even where there had been no stream. Railroads that carried over 65 per cent of the milk supply for the city of Boston were put out of commission overnight and left twisted masses of iron and wood, with no semblance of roadbeds. As a result, the Central Vermont Railway, which traverses the State, is in the hands of a receiver. Normal traffic conditions can not be resumed for months. About 60 people were drowned, including Hon. S. Hollister Jackson, lieutenant governor, as fine a type of citizen and public official as ever served a State.

A vivid pen picture of the rushing, rising flood of waters and the heroic endeavors of the people to battle them is drawn by the Hon. Luther B. Johnson, editor of the Randolph (Vt.) Herald, in the following words:

In the face of the overpowering waters, beating ceaselessly for passage, and constantly rising, inch by inch, a foot or more an hour, before one's eyes, man's puny opposition was futile. Yet how men strove to save and protect! With shovels, axes, trees, timbers, loads of stone, sandbags, and everything that would serve as an impediment, they fought the streams—fought hard and long, long into the blackness of night, but seldom with avail. The watery monster was for once their master.

What happened during that horrible night the succeeding pages tell only in part. Mostly it went on unseen. The ravaging flood here and there claimed its single victim or its entire family without the then knowledge of others. Here and there isolated groups or individuals were taken from their fated homes at imminent peril in Stygian darkness or by the fitful gleam of lantern or flash light. During that night prodigies of valor were performed. Sometimes these deeds saved those beleaguered; sometimes, though just as valorous, they failed.

Unchecked longer by human effort, the flood itself ran its course, seemingly swollen by pride in its achievements, and roaring loudly to proclaim its triumph. Instead of small driftwood, it now bore at racing speed dwellings, barns, sometimes shattered, sometimes whole, with lights still burning, and in them hastening to death were occasionally fathers, mothers, children, horses, cattle, livestock of all kinds. It bore also bridges, huge and small, torn from their foundations; dams wrenched from their firm beds; even immense rocks and heavy machinery rolled and tumbled along. It invaded whole towns and cities, filling shops and stores, driving people to second floors and attics. It ruined hopelessly large stocks of merchandise and the treasured, hard-earned furnishings of homes, both rich and humble. It carried out scores of railroad bridges built of iron, cement, and stone; washed down great embankments and left the tracks suspended for long distances in air, sometimes on edge, sometimes turned over. In a few places new chasms yawned during that night and engulfed almost entire villages.

With dawn on Friday, November 4, the drenching rain continuing, but somewhat abated in violence, came a scene never to be forgotten and to be recalled with a shudder. All that the imagination of the awful night had pictured was more than realized. A single 12 hours had completely changed the landscape, and in many places the geography, of practically all the river and brook courses of Vermont. Streams ran where they had never run before since the coming of the white man. Their old beds lay stone strewn and hollow. Whole meadows of fine land were gone, acres of rich soil eaten away in the night, and the still hungry waters crumpling them back further, foot by foot. Habitations and buildings and living beings were gone. Bridge abutments stood mutely mourning their uselessness. All the

destruction of the night and previous afternoon was revealed with the coming of another day. Yet not all—more was to be revealed when the waters subsided.

The experience of Montpelier, the State capital, is typical. After hours of downpour, water began to come into the streets about 5 o'clock in the afternoon. Four hours later it had become a raging flood 10 to 12 feet deep, running with such force that an automobile, caught in its course and striking a tree, would be wrapped about it like a piece of paper. Every window in the business houses on the street levels was broken, whole stocks of goods and fixtures were swept out and lost, with the result that every business place where merchandise was sold was compelled to close. Then the waters rushed on down the Winooski spreading ruin, death, and destruction everywhere within the confines of the valley. In many places landscapes were completely changed; what were once villages with houses and streets became areas of barren, jagged rocks or yawning chasms.

What of the damage? A survey was made under the direction of the governor. A survey was made by the Bureau of Public Roads under the direction of the Secretary of Agriculture. Secretary Herbert Hoover, of the Department of Commerce, visited the stricken area by direction of the President and estimated the loss. Out of these examinations we have been able to arrive at a fairly accurate estimate of the losses sustained.

ROAD AND BRIDGE DAMAGE

The State highway department has estimated the road and bridge damage as follows:

Federal-aid system	\$2,653,733
State-aid system	2,954,052
Unselected highways	1,866,012
Total	7,062,998

The Bureau of Public Roads after a careful survey estimated the road and bridge damages as follows:

Federal-aid system	\$2,502,133
State-aid system	3,105,652
Unselected highways	1,769,684
Total	7,377,469

It will be seen by these estimates that the Bureau of Public Roads places the total damage \$314,471 more than the estimate made by the State officials.

The State road mileage is divided as follows:

	Miles
Federal-aid roads	1,043
State-aid other than Federal aid	3,322
Unselected highways	10,705
Total	15,070

We have 1 mile of highway to every 23 of our population. The damages to highways and bridges alone is equal to a per capita assessment of \$21 on every person in the State.

Summary of returns of estimated property losses and damages to February 6, 1928

AGRICULTURAL DIVISION

Number	Losses and damages	Total
690 farms	\$1,350,156	\$1,350,156
HIGHWAY AND BRIDGE DIVISION		
Highways	2,483,916	
1,238 bridges	4,579,082	
		7,062,998
INDUSTRIAL DIVISION		
264 establishments	5,558,900	5,558,900
CITIES AND VILLAGES DIVISION		
137 cities and villages	6,403,651	
Vermont State Hospital at Waterbury	400,000	
12 railroads and electric railways	7,019,200	
New England Telegraph & Telephone Co.	250,000	
Western Union Telegraph Co.	65,000	
3 gas companies	30,400	
2 independent telephone companies	4,050	
		14,172,301
ADDITIONAL ESTIMATES		
Difference between actual reports received and estimated losses:		
Agriculture	\$49,844	
Industries	1,441,100	
		2,290,944
Grand total		30,435,299

CASUALTIES

Lives lost..... 62

The total loss is equal to a per capita loss of \$86 for every man, woman, and child in the State. It is equal to one-tenth of all the property in the State assessed for taxation. On the basis of wealth, the Vermont flood disaster would be comparable to a disaster overtaking the District of Columbia and causing a damage of \$60,000,000; to a disaster in North Carolina causing a damage of \$150,000,000; a disaster in Arkansas causing a damage of \$90,000,000; in Massachusetts, causing a damage of \$480,000,000; in California, causing a damage of \$570,000,000.

The damage to Federal-aided and State-aided highways and bridges in Vermont is nearly twice the amount of damage caused by the recent floods in the whole Mississippi Valley for similar classes of roads.

I have called your attention only to actual damages. When we consider that the indirect business losses will amount to more than \$100,000,000 in addition to the direct losses, you get some conception of our great disaster. Where does the history of our Nation record a greater one?

Vermonters find themselves in a novel situation. We do not easily adjust ourselves to it. During an existence of 136 years as a State we have never come to the Federal Government and asked for help. We have given cheerfully of our money and manhood to the service of the Union, that it might be great and strong. Our proud, self-reliant people are loath to ask for assistance now. We are believers in State independence. If all the States would care for losses from disasters, we would bear our burden without complaint. But the present policy of the Federal Government is to step forth and lend a helping hand to any single member of the sisterhood that suffers from a great disaster.

I have introduced a bill (H. R. 9767) which authorizes an appropriation of \$2,654,000 for the relief in the matter of roads and bridges damaged, to be expended in accordance with the provisions of the Federal highway act, except that the provision limiting Federal payments to not exceeding \$15,000 per mile and the provision restricting expenditure of Federal funds upon roads within municipalities having a population of 2,500 or more shall not apply. The amount named is practically the amount of damage to Federal roads and bridges. The State of Vermont under this act must match the money appropriated by the Federal Government, dollar for dollar. The bill has the approval of the Bureau of Public Roads, the Department of Agriculture, and the Bureau of the Budget.

The bill was submitted to the Secretary of Agriculture for recommendation and report. Under date of March 16, Acting Secretary R. W. Dunlap replied in writing. After reviewing the provisions of the bill, the essential portion of his recommendation is as follows:

The investigations made by the Bureau of Public Roads in cooperation with the highway department of Vermont as to the damages to roads and bridges in the State occasioned by the recent flood convinces this department that legislation of the kind proposed is very meritorious. The department, therefore, would like to see favorable action on the bill.

The department's letter was submitted to the Bureau of the Budget for its recommendation and bears the following notation of that bureau:

Submitted to the Bureau of the Budget, pursuant to Circular No. 49 of that bureau, and returned to the Department of Agriculture under date of March 16 with the advice that the legislation proposed in H. R. 9767 would not be in conflict with the financial program of the President.

It is fortunate that the Bureau of Public Roads in cooperation with the Vermont Highway Department conducted a survey during the summer of 1927 of the transportation on the highways of the State. While most of the work went for naught owing to destruction by the November flood, the report of the survey, but recently printed, afforded valuable information as to the use of Vermont's Federal-aid and State roads by motor vehicles of other States. It appears from this report that 35 per cent of the travel over these roads is by motor vehicles from without the State. The report furnished the Bureau of Public Roads information upon which it could base its recommendations as to what is a reasonable amount for the Federal Government to contribute toward the rehabilitation of Federal-aid roads in Vermont. If 35 per cent of the traffic on our roads is from without the State—the report furnished the Bureau of Public Roads information upon which it could base its recommendations as to what is a reasonable amount for the Federal Government to contribute toward the rehabilitation of Federal-aid roads in Vermont—if 35 per cent of the traffic on our roads is from without the State, the Federal Government has a great interest in their reconstruction.

A hearing has been held by the Committee on Roads of the House. The bill has been reported favorably by a unanimous vote. Owing to the early approach of spring, when work on the roads can be resumed, and the necessity of letting contracts at an early date, it is hoped that early action may be had on the part of the House.

Suffering from one of the greatest calamities that ever befell the people of a State in the history of the Nation, we are undertaking the problem of rehabilitation with courage. We are not faltering. Filled with the same spirit that actuated our forebears when they entered a trackless wilderness and with resolution and courage carved out a State and maintained its independence for years, and we are coming back.

Give us encouragement by granting the help asked for in our great emergency, and in a short time we will welcome you to old Vermont, the first to cast her lot with the original thirteen, welcome you with genuine hospitality to a land of beauty, with winding roads over hills and through valleys, to a State of as brave men as ever answered the call of service and of as fair women as ever graced the family fireside.

Mr. BRIGHAM. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 9767, introduced by my colleague, Mr. Gibson, and reported favorably by the Committee on Roads, authorizes an appropriation of \$2,654,000 for the relief of Vermont in the matter of highways damaged by flood. It is my purpose to outline briefly the reasons why representatives of Vermont are asking for this appropriation.

The newspapers have carried such a complete story of the flood which descended upon Vermont in November, 1927, that you are probably already somewhat familiar with the destruction of property which it caused and the toll of human life which it levied. The people of Vermont are now face to face with the difficult problem of rehabilitation.

The legislative reference service of the Library of Congress has compiled a list of the acts passed by the Congress for the relief of those who have suffered from calamities of various kinds. These acts go back to 1803 and revised to date would include the following item in the deficiency bill passed in the opening days of this session of Congress:

Emergency flood control, Mississippi River: For reimbursement of the appropriation for "flood control, Mississippi River," and the appropriation for "Maintenance and improvement of existing river and harbor works," for amounts expended therefrom for emergency work on the lower Mississippi River on account of the flood of 1927, \$7,000,000.

It would also include the following item in the War Department appropriation bill recently passed:

FLOOD RELIEF

Flood relief, Mississippi River: For the reimbursement of funds contributed by local interests to the Mississippi River Commission, and used for emergency levee construction and repair work on the lower

Mississippi River on account of the flood of 1927, \$1,500,000, to be immediately available and to be expended by the Mississippi River Commission: *Provided*, That the provisions of the flood control act approved March 1, 1917, in so far as they forbid expenditures by the Mississippi River Commission for levee work unless local interests contribute one-third the cost thereof, shall not apply to emergency levee work done, or to be done, on account of the flood of 1927.

If you will go through this list of acts, going back a century and a quarter, you will find none for the relief of the State of Vermont or of any political subdivision thereof. I believe that this is the first time that representatives of Vermont in the 136 years of its membership in the Union have appeared before a committee of Congress asking for relief. Such calamities as we have had heretofore have been within the capacity of our self-reliant people to meet. I assure you that we appear here now only because a disaster has befallen our State so overwhelming that it is without parallel in her history.

We are accustomed these days to think of things in terms of size. Because of this the attention of the Nation is, and has been for months, centered upon the flood disaster in the valley of the Mississippi. I wish in no way to minimize the terrible disaster which has overtaken our people in the Mississippi Valley. Figures as well as pictures tell a story of appalling destruction there. Nor do I question their dire need of assistance nor the wisdom of an emergency measure which carried with it the expenditure of \$7,000,000 in their behalf, but it does give me confidence to bring our needs to your attention, and it does give me the hope that in proportion as our needs equal theirs we may look for like assistance. Let us, then, in order to grasp the extent of the Vermont flood disaster, compare for a moment the damage done to our little State with the damage done to the several States which suffered from the Mississippi flood. This comparison should, I think, be made in terms of relative population and wealth, so the problems presented to the people and the government of each of the several afflicted States may by comparison be made more clear.

In making this comparison for the States of Illinois, Missouri, Kentucky, Tennessee, Mississippi, and Louisiana, which suffered from the Mississippi flood I have used the estimates of the damage done as given in a pamphlet entitled, "Losses and Damages Resulting from the Flood of 1927," published by the Mississippi River Flood Association. For damage done by the flood in Vermont I have used the latest revised estimates furnished by the Governor of Vermont. It is only fair to the State of Kentucky for me to say that that State suffered damages from another flood occurring at a later time, which does not appear in this record.

The following table shows the relative population, area, and total flood damage done to the Mississippi Valley States and to Vermont and translates these losses in terms of their meaning to the persons involved and their ability to meet them:

State	Population, 1920	Area in square miles	Flood damage, 1927	Wealth in thousands, 1922	Per capita flood damage	Flood damage per million dollars of State wealth
Arkansas.....	1,752,204	53,335	\$37,948,919	\$2,590,617	\$21.66	\$14,600
Illinois.....	6,485,280	56,665	16,765,465	22,232,794	2.59	750
Kentucky.....	2,416,630	40,598	3,295,750	3,582,391	1.37	674
Louisiana.....	1,768,509	48,506	38,389,814	3,416,860	21.35	11,240
Mississippi.....	1,790,618	46,865	45,931,294	2,177,660	25.65	21,060
Missouri.....	3,404,055	69,420	7,691,265	9,981,409	2.26	770
Tennessee.....	2,416,630	42,022	5,958,950	4,228,251	2.47	9,410
Vermont.....	332,428	9,564	30,435,299	842,040	86.35	36,146

You will see from this comparison that only the three lower Mississippi Valley States of Arkansas, Mississippi, and Louisiana suffered a total flood damage exceeding that of Vermont. You will see also that the damage per person in Vermont was more than three times the damage per person in the average of the Mississippi States worst afflicted, and the damage per million dollars of State wealth, which means capacity to meet loss, in Vermont is more than twice that suffered by Arkansas, more than three times that suffered by Louisiana, and is more than one-half greater than that suffered by the State of Mississippi—the three States sustaining the greatest flood damage in the Mississippi Valley.

This, I think, will make clear to the membership of the House what a flood loss of \$30,435,299, visited upon a small rural State with a small population, means to the people of that State, and will explain why we, as representatives of that State, are here asking you to pass a bill which will grant help from the Federal Government to our people in meeting a difficult problem.

RELIEF LIMITED TO PUBLIC WORKS

Our request for relief is limited to the rehabilitation of public works—namely, roads. Our losses to private property have borne heavily upon farmers, business men, and corporations. One of our main railroad lines is in the hands of a receiver and will probably not resume normal operations for months to come. Other lines have spent millions to repair damages. Many farmers and business men have lost their savings of a lifetime and are being assisted to carry on by the Red Cross, by private gifts, by loans from the Vermont flood corporation, from banks, and from various other sources. We are asking for no appropriation to help our people meet losses of this kind. You can readily see, however, that the tax-paying ability of our people is greatly impaired, and it is extremely difficult for a small State to meet the tremendous burden imposed and, for years to come, next to impossible for it unassisted to carry on its normal activities.

Vermont is, as you know, a mountainous State. Its river valleys as they cut across or run parallel to the mountain ranges

are for the most part narrow and hemmed in by hills on either side. The main roads are located in these valleys and received the full force of the rushing water, which could be likened in its fury but to a storm at sea. When the flood waters receded Vermont found herself practically without a road system in large areas of the State. Roads and bridges which it had taken a century to construct were destroyed in one short day. Photographs well illustrate this.

As soon as the extent of the damage was known the State highway department laid plans for making temporary repairs in order to make it possible to deliver the mails and to transport food and supplies to the towns and cities which were cut off from rail transportation. The cooperation of local town officials in this work was splendid. I heard an Army engineer pay tribute to the resourcefulness of Vermont town officials who in a remarkably short space of time threw temporary bridges of logs and plank across rivers and smaller streams and filled great gullies in roads so that traffic could get through. I am informed that the temporary road repairs alone will cost nearly \$1,000,000.

Then came the problem of permanent reconstruction. The Federal Bureau of Public Roads very generously came to our assistance and detailed a force of engineers to make estimates of the cost of reconstruction. Our roads in Vermont are divided into three classes—Federal-aid, State-aid, and town roads. The Bureau of Public Roads has made the following report as to the damage done by the flood to roads and bridges in Vermont. I have inserted the mileage of roads of each class:

	Miles	Damages from flood		Total
		Roads	Bridges	
Federal-aid system.....	1,043	\$983,213	\$1,670,520	\$2,653,733
State-aid system.....	3,419	690,930	2,263,122	2,954,052
Town roads.....	10,408	390,288	1,370,396	1,760,684
Total.....	14,870	2,073,431	5,304,038	7,377,469

The State has always cooperated with the towns on the Federal-aid and State-aid systems, but only in a very minor way on the town roads. The burden thrown upon many of the river towns, however, would have bankrupted these towns had they been obliged to bear the burden of restoring the road system. Therefore the governor called the legislature into special session, and an act was passed to authorize the State to assume the burden of restoring the highways by a bond issue for this purpose.

Now, I can perhaps illustrate to the committee the extent of the burden which has been placed upon the State of Vermont to meet this task of restoring its highway system by again making a comparison with the Mississippi Valley States. The following table will show the relative total damage to highways and bridges, the highway damage per person, per mile of road, and the total per capita tax as prepared by the Census Bureau for 1922:

State	Flood damages to highways and bridges, 1927	Flood damages to highways and bridges per person, 1927	Damages to highways and bridges per mile of road	Total per capita tax (State)
Arkansas.....	\$1,268,715	\$0.72	\$17.64	\$13.87
Illinois.....	38,000	.006	.39	40.76
Kentucky.....	5,000	.002	.09	19.40
Louisiana.....	550,000	.306	13.75	29.20
Mississippi.....	400,000	.223	7.55	20.99
Missouri.....	376,407	.111	3.38	29.01
Tennessee.....	100,000	.04	1.53	18.46
Vermont.....	7,377,469	20.93	495.14	34.29

The highway losses for the Mississippi Valley States are taken from the estimates of the Mississippi River Flood Control Association and for Vermont from the estimates of the Federal Bureau of Public Roads. The highway losses from the June flood in Kentucky are not included.

You will see that in highway losses suffered from the flood Vermont stands in a class by herself. You will see also from the rate of taxation already paid how difficult it will be for Vermont to repair the damage caused by the flood and at the same time keep up the new construction which the demands of increasing traffic made upon our highway system.

VERMONT'S HIGHWAY PROBLEM

The highway problem in Vermont has been the subject of a recent cooperative study by the United States Bureau of Public Roads and the Vermont Highway Department. This bureau in

conjunction with the State highway department made a survey of traffic on the Vermont highways in 1926. Upon this survey and upon predictions as to future needs, recommendations were made in a report recently released as to what Vermont should do in the way of future road construction. Up to 1923 roads constructed in Vermont were principally of gravel surfaces. They were not in all cases the best roads but they were such as we could pay for. It became apparent, however, that on our main routes, including the Federal-aid designated system and some of the State roads a surface superior to gravel was necessary because traffic had increased to the point where the cost of maintenance of gravel surfaces made the construction of a surface superior to gravel necessary. The report recommends a construction program for the years 1927-1931 of 275 miles of surface superior to gravel on the principal routes, which are Federal-aid routes, at an estimated cost of \$12,000,000. Then in continuation of this program it recommends for the years 1931-1936 the construction of 278 miles additional, all except 80 miles on the Federal-aid routes, with a probable cost of another \$12,000,000. The regular annual Federal-aid allotment for Vermont is \$365,000. This 10-year program would cost a total of \$24,000,000. This program of construction was entered upon by the Vermont Legislature of 1927, and during the last year 47.2 miles of hard-surface roads have been constructed at a cost of \$1,877,247.

Now, this survey also shows that Vermont roads—and I presume this is true of the roads of all the States—have taken on an interstate and international character. It showed that on our Federal-aid routes and on nearly 1,000 miles of our State-aid system about 35.6 per cent of total passenger-car traffic and 9.6 per cent of the truck traffic was foreign traffic. For instance, the survey showed that of the total traffic on United States numbered route 7, which runs along the western border of Vermont from Massachusetts to Canada, 43.3 per cent was foreign passenger-car traffic. On United States route 5, on the eastern border of Vermont, 46.7 per cent was foreign traffic. The international character of these highways is shown by the fact that of the 815,370 cars which reported in the Vermont customs district in 1927, only 377,892 were Vermont cars. United States routes No. 2 and No. 4 are main through routes between New York and New Hampshire, and their traffic is made up of 34.3 per cent and 37 per cent, respectively, of foreign traffic.

The burden thrown upon Vermont roads by this foreign traffic is indicated by this paragraph from the report:

The large volume of foreign traffic on Vermont highways adds considerable to the cost of providing highway service on the main routes of travel. This volume of foreign traffic, in addition to local Vermont traffic, results in increased maintenance costs on present improvements, which are loaded beyond their economic capacity, and makes necessary earlier improvement or reconstruction of these routes by the construction of surfaces superior to gravel. The present contribution of foreign traffic to Vermont highways revenue is limited very largely to that derived from the taxation of gasoline sold to operators of foreign cars, and it is doubtful if this revenue is at all commensurate with the increased cost of providing highway service caused by foreign traffic.

Now, Vermont wants to keep her place with her sister States in the line of progress. She wants to provide roads for foreign traffic as well as for her own people, and her policies were being formulated to that end before the recent disaster overtook her.

Vermont is a dairy State, marketing her products in the form of milk and cream. According to a recent survey, made by the United States Department of Agriculture, Boston depends upon Vermont for 62 per cent of her milk and 50 per cent of her cream supply. Other New England cities and New York also obtain from our dairies substantial quantities. These products are perishable and must move from farm to market every day. Unless our roads are restored these cities will obtain with difficulty an essential food supply and the main business of our State will be disrupted.

From the figures presented as to cost of rehabilitating our highway system, you will see that the State of Vermont will have to pay more than seven and three-fourths millions of dollars for permanent reconstruction, in addition to nearly a million dollars already spent for temporary construction. This is more than a small State like ours can bear and expect to do anything in the way of new construction. Therefore we are asking the Federal Government in this bill to assume the cost of reconstructing that part of our highways known as the Federal-aid system.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Idaho, BURTON L. FRENCH, chairman of the subcommittee on the naval affairs appropriation bill, may ad-

dress the House for 20 minutes immediately after the reading of the Journal and disposition of business on the Speaker's table.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to say to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee that we had reached an agreement with those on that side that the gentleman from Idaho was to have 20 minutes of the time that is allotted to the Members against the bill on that side.

Mr. MADDEN. But he is not against the bill.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. The minority against the bill wants information which the gentleman from Idaho can give us.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my request.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the gentleman in charge of the bill if it is fair to yield the time that is allotted to those against the bill to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH], when he knows that our friend from Idaho is for the bill? There ought to be an equal division of time on such an important measure as this \$274,000,000 bill.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. The gentleman knows I am opposed to the bill.

Mr. BLANTON. But there is no agreement in the House that that can be done. I understand there is no request approved by the House that that be done.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BLANTON. I will.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. It is important to have information not only as to the cost of building these ships but also as to the cost of maintaining them, and as part of the opposition I am very anxious that the House should have that information.

Mr. BLANTON. But there is a question of policy that is more important even than the \$274,000,000 cost of these ships. It is the question of the policy of the Government as to whether it is going to be peaceful or militaristic. But there has been no such request such as that proposed made to the House, so, of course, there is nothing before the House.

EXTENDING TIME OF GENERAL DEBATE ON BILL FOR NAVAL CONSTRUCTION

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask permission to speak for a minute or two.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to address the House for two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUTLER. I do not know what gentlemen will say except one gentleman whom I esteem, and who has 15 minutes accorded him. He is opposed to this bill on principle. I do not know the views of other gentlemen who wish to speak; but how in the world we are to accommodate the Members of this House who desire to speak on this great public measure I do not know.

I want to say this: I introduced the rule fixing the time at not less than 10 hours. In my absence at home trying to get rid of a physical ailment that bothered me a lot my committee saw fit to reduce it to six hours, and here I am with this long list of Members of this House who are entitled to be heard on this public measure and who wish to be heard.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Will the gentleman yield to me for a suggestion?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Why does not the gentleman ask unanimous consent that the time be extended four additional hours?

Mr. BUTLER. The gentleman was present when the time in the rule which I introduced was reduced, so I suggest that he fix it right. I am not responsible.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. The gentleman knows that two hours have been added to the time, making eight hours altogether.

Mr. BUTLER. I talked with almost 100 Members of the House before I asked for 10 hours originally and, therefore, I was supposed to know something about it. Here are gentlemen in front of me now who desire to say something concerning this bill. I do not know what the gentlemen will say, but they are Members of the House and are entitled to be heard. It is getting to be commonly understood that public debate in this House is no longer tolerated. When I introduced this rule, I did it for the purpose of affording all gentlemen an opportunity to express themselves upon this bill, one way or the other, and I repeat that during my absence the committee to which I belong and whose membership I greatly care for saw fit to reduce the time to six hours. Now, they can fix it up the best way they know how.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I will state to the gentleman that when we appeared before the Rules Committee we thought that probably six hours would be enough. Yesterday two additional hours were given. As the chairman has requests for speeches to be made both for and against the bill, I might suggest that under the five-minute rule there will be ample opportunity accorded every Member of the House who desires to discuss the bill pro or con. Why does the gentleman care to prolong general debate when ample opportunity will be given under the five-minute rule to debate the bill?

Mr. BUTLER. My friend, this is the last time I shall ever endeavor to divide two hours' time among 40 or 50 speech makers. My friend may do it the next time.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I am simply making this suggestion to the gentleman.

Mr. BUTLER. The gentleman is able to do many things, and the gentleman may be able to make this division of time to the satisfaction of these gentlemen.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Why does not the gentleman ask for two more hours of general debate?

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that time for general debate on this bill may be extended one hour, with the express purpose of accommodating the gentlemen who desire to speak upon this measure, this time to be divided according to the way the time has already been divided.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that general debate upon the naval bill be extended one hour, one-half to be used by those in favor and one-half by those opposed to the bill. Is there objection?

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to proceed for just 10 seconds. Some gentlemen say this will carry us into tomorrow. We are paid to be here to-morrow and it is a working day. Other gentlemen complained to me they were kept here all yesterday afternoon waiting to speak; they were paid to be here. Some complain because the Secretary of the Navy occupied a seat, when we, all of us who were here, know he could have had 250 seats in this Chamber if he had desired them.

Mr. BLANTON. I doubt that, unless the people had said so. The people fill these seats here.

Mr. BUTLER. And I remember the time when the gentleman's party was in control of the House here and members of the Cabinet occupied seats on the floor and we welcomed them here.

Mr. BLANTON. But they did not come here and interfere with a bill in which they themselves were interested.

Mr. BUTLER. And there was no such interference here yesterday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

STONE MOUNTAIN MONUMENT

The SPEAKER. By authority of Senate Concurrent Resolution 12, which passed the House yesterday afternoon, the Chair desires to announce the appointment of the following committee:

Mr. THOMAS M. BELL, Georgia; Mr. JOHN Q. TILSON, Connecticut; Mr. LOUIS T. McFADDEN, Pennsylvania; Mr. C. WILLIAM RAMSEYER, Iowa; Mr. JOHN M. ROBSON, Kentucky; Mr. CHARLES L. FAUST, Missouri; Mr. ANDREW J. MONTAGUE, Virginia; Mr. CLARENCE F. LEA, California; Mr. JOHN J. O'CONNOR, New York; and Mr. WILLIAM W. ARNOLD, Illinois.

CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN NAVAL VESSELS

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 11526) to authorize the construction of certain naval vessels, and for other purposes.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I supplement that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the naval construction bill, with Mr. BACON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Chairman, will the Chair kindly inform me of the amount of time I have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is informed that the gentleman from Oklahoma has 58 minutes remaining; the gentleman from Georgia has 53 minutes remaining; the gentleman from Pennsylvania has 60 minutes remaining against the bill and 56 minutes remaining in favor of the bill.

Mr. BUTLER. Does that include the extra hour?

The CHAIRMAN. That includes the additional hour.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, of that one hour I desire to yield 10 minutes of the time to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH], and I understand the gentleman from Georgia [Mr.

VINSON] will also yield to the gentleman 10 minutes, so that the gentleman may have 20 minutes' time.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Idaho 10 minutes.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. The agreement was that the time allotted to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McCLINTIC] was to be used by those against this bill. The gentleman is not able to grant those of us who are against the bill the full time we would like to have, and it is well known that the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH] is for the bill.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I am yielding the 10 minutes, I will say to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Chairman, I demand the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, in considering a bill of the magnitude of the shipbuilding authorization bill now pending (H. R. 11526), there is one most

important factor that ought to be in the minds of all Members, because it is a factor that will continue to carry on throughout the years following the enactment of whatever measure may be adopted providing for the increase of the Navy.

I refer to the element of cost. In this connection the Congress and the country should have in mind the true perspective that can be had only by fitting the proposed program into the existing Naval Establishment and considering beyond this, as best we may, additional building programs that the near future will demand and the cost of maintaining such programs. When I speak of the cost of maintaining such programs I do not have in mind alone the cost of building of ships. I have in mind the cost of shore stations, the cost of upkeep, the cost of officers and men, the cost, in fact, that the Naval Establishment as such must be to our Nation throughout the years to come.

At this point I shall insert in my remarks the table that is before you showing in an approximate way the Navy of the United States translated into dollars and extending over the period of years over which construction will progress under the pending bill:

	1929	1930	1931	1932	1933	1934	1935
A							
Maintenance of Navy on basis of 1929.....	\$287,404,470	\$287,404,470	\$287,404,470	\$287,404,470	\$287,404,470	\$287,404,470	\$287,404,470
Existing program, 8 cruisers, 2 submarines.....	72,240,000	² 60,696,250	31,348,100	19,244,300	17,144,300	15,444,300	15,444,300
Additional aircraft ¹	635,000	3,453,750	3,791,900	1,755,700	1,755,700	1,755,700	1,755,700
Total.....	360,279,470	351,554,470	322,544,470	308,404,470	306,304,470	304,604,470	304,604,470
B							
Naval bill (H. R. 11526):							
15 cruisers.....	10,000,000	37,000,000	65,000,000	75,000,000	48,000,000	20,000,000	-----
1 carrier.....	3,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	4,000,000	-----	-----	-----
Aircraft for new vessel ¹	-----	193,500	2,629,350	7,602,075	3,320,700	2,795,250	2,795,250
Modernizing Pennsylvania and Arizona ¹	-----	7,400,000	7,400,000	-----	-----	-----	-----
Total.....	13,000,000	50,593,500	81,029,350	86,602,075	51,320,700	22,795,250	2,795,250
Grand total, A and B.....	373,279,470	³ 402,147,970	⁴ 403,573,820	⁴ 395,006,545	⁴ 357,625,170	⁴ 327,399,720	⁴ 307,399,720

¹ Not authorized.

² \$2,900,000 not authorized but necessary for submarine increase in cost.

Total appropriations, 1928, \$338,806,477.90.

³ Unknown possible future building costs.

⁴ Unknown possible future operating costs.

In interpreting the table bear in mind the following features: Section A refers to the Naval Establishment as it is to-day, together with existing programs authorized by law or apparently necessary to round out that which now rests upon law.

The item "Maintenance," as carried through from 1929 to 1935, rests upon the maintenance cost for 1929 alone, and must probably be regarded as the minimum maintenance cost for succeeding years for an equivalent establishment, and to which will need to be added additional maintenance costs that new programs will entail.

Section B refers to the pending bill and the allocation of cost of construction as indicated by the committee report upon the bill plus aircraft that will apparently be necessary for the 15 cruisers and the 1 aircraft carrier and plus the amounts necessary for the modernization of the *Pennsylvania* and the *Arizona*, for which legislation is pending.

The totals are suggestive of sections A and B and do not include the two great factors on the table, unknown possible future building costs, and unknown possible future operating costs.

At this point may I say that in general the bill will have my support. I am not in accord with every feature included within its bounds; but on the other hand, it represents so generally the policy it seems this country must follow now, that I doubt if any number of men equal to the number of men who shaped the bill could be assembled from the membership of this body who could shape a measure that would better represent the cross section of sentiment on a naval construction program.

As to fixing a limit of time within which the ships may be laid down, I would strike it out were it in my power. Certainly, I would not require that these ships be laid down within the next three years. I believe a wiser and more economical program, if any time limit must be fixed, would be attained were we to say that three ships would be laid down in each of the five succeeding years. Better, still, it would be if we left out the time element entirely and let that question be determined by the administration and by Congress from year to year.

However, on that question I am not going to oppose the committee program which has been adopted after mature deliberation.

In another paragraph, section 2, it is provided that—the Secretary of the Navy is directed to submit annually through the Bureau of the Budget estimates for the construction of the foregoing vessels.

The word "through" ought to be "to," and I understand that an amendment will come from the Committee on Naval Affairs making the change.

Mr. BRITTEN. That is the agreement between myself and the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. MADDEN], who made the suggestion. We think it is a good suggestion.

Mr. FRENCH. That is very fine. There is one other thought I ought to submit at this time, and that has relation to the time limit. Notwithstanding the fact that Congress may say that future Congresses shall appropriate for laying down five cruisers a year, we must remember that what we may do upon that point is rather by way of suggestion of a policy, and that it is in no way binding upon future Congresses. It may be that another Congress would feel that we should speed up the program of building. If so, it would be well within its jurisdiction to provide the money for speeding up. It may be that a future Congress would feel that conditions did not warrant so rapid progress of development of program; and if so, it would be for that Congress to exercise its judgment untrammelled and unhampered by what we may do.

Now, notice the table. For 1929 this Congress in a bill that we shall report next week will carry for maintenance approximately \$287,404,470. To that must be added the construction costs for new building on programs already under way, cruisers, submarines, and necessary aircraft. The total for 1929 for the existing establishment thus becomes \$360,279,470. To that, should the plans of the proponents of the pending measure be carried out, must be added another \$13,000,000 for commencement of work on five new cruisers and the aircraft carrier that are proposed. I have then carried the program forward by costs from year to year, adding certain modernization of battleship costs and adding costs of prospective aircraft that will be necessary.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. BRITTEN. The gentleman has twice referred to aircraft in connection with his recent figures. Is he not really talking about the existing construction program and not aircraft?

Mr. FRENCH. I shall refer to that. I have included in the existing program that which is building in ships and aircraft, and when I refer to the existing building program, I refer, of course, to the 8 cruisers and the 2 fleet submarines which are now building. The \$2,900,000 refers to the proposed in-

crease in limit of cost for the two fleet submarines. Under the heading "Additional aircraft," I refer to the aircraft that doubtless will be necessary for the cruisers and to certain reserve aircraft that is part of the program the present Congress has been asked to consider.

Within the existing program I include the two dirigibles that will cost \$8,000,000, and I include the replacement cost of planes throughout, and from 1932 throughout the following years the replacement cost of the additional aircraft needed.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. And what is that for 1935?

Mr. FRENCH. For 1935, for the 8 cruisers now building, it would be \$1,755,700; for the 15 cruisers and airplane carrier it would be \$2,795,250; and for the five-year program that we are now carrying forward it will be \$15,444,300.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. FRENCH. I prefer to go on and make my statement.

Mr. MADDEN. If the gentleman will yield him more time, I think the gentleman from Idaho will answer all of the questions that may be in the mind of the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I shall be very glad to yield him a minute right now.

Mr. FRENCH. May I continue? I think it would be better if I may do so. Then later I shall be glad to yield.

FUTURE BUILDING COSTS

I approach now another part of the story that is even more startling when you think of the years beyond 1931. The chart might seem to indicate that we have a diminishing program, but that is not the case. We must now take into account two unknown factors. The unknown factors are the possible future building costs and the possible future operating costs. What are they? First, the limitation of armament treaty provides for four additional airplane carriers. The one you have reported will cost \$19,000,000. Four more must probably be added to this column.

Under the treaty, in 1931 we may begin a replacement program on capital ships. Under that program, unless it shall be changed, we would be called upon to lay down in 1931, 3 capital ships; in 1932, 3; in 1933, 2; in 1934, 2; and in 1935, 1—11 capital ships if we shall replace at present tonnage per ship. If we shall increase that tonnage to 35,000 tons we may lay down 8. What will these ships cost? Will it be \$40,000,000 each? Will it be \$50,000,000?

Mr. BUTLER. We estimate \$40,000,000.

Mr. FRENCH. At \$40,000,000, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania estimates, you would need to add from \$320,000,000 to \$440,000,000, if you figure replacement cost to the time of completion. Modernization of capital ships after 1931 is a possible alternative program that might do for a while.

To-day we are modernizing two capital ships, the *Oklahoma* and the *Nevada*. Next year you propose as possible the *Pennsylvania* and the *Arizona*. I understand that the department is advocating the modernization of three others of our capital ships, and that will cost probably another \$20,000,000 or \$21,000,000.

Again, the bill which you have reported proposes the construction of a salvage ship. What will it cost? Possibly four or five million dollars. According to the report of the committee, it is indicated that the existing law provides for 12 destroyer leaders. How many we shall build I do not know; but in view of the fact that request was made for destroyer leaders of the Naval Affairs Committee before the committee determined that the existing law provided for authorization from which 12 could be built, it is apparent that the Navy Department wants a certain number of destroyer leaders.

What will that cost? It is in that indefinite block of plans. Then, as to fleet submarines, the department asks for further legislative authority. Your committee found that under the program of 1916 there seems to be authority for three fleet submarines in addition to those already begun. What will they cost? Possibly another \$20,000,000 or more.

Shore stations: We are told by the officers as they come before the committee that, although not authorized, the program ahead calls for \$13,000,000 to be expended upon the shore stations in the interest of the Naval Establishment.

We are told that if the dirigible that you have already authorized shall be completed, it will mean an additional hangar. What is the cost of an additional hangar? The one at Lakehurst cost \$2,632,247 as originally planned, to which was added \$635,000, or a total of \$3,267,247.

Probably a new hangar would cost more.

You will be asked for high-explosive depots, to cost additional millions.

FUTURE POSSIBLE OPERATING COSTS

We then go to operations. What are you going to do with the ships after you will have completed them? Will they be merely to stand by? Will they be put into service? Are they to be replacement ships? We have not worked out that part of the program.

As to the maintenance and operation of one of the new cruisers that you have provided in this bill, the department estimates it will cost \$1,247,500. Multiply this cost by 15. The carrier you are providing will probably cost, to operate, \$3,179,000. There is pressure now for increasing the number of midshipmen to the Naval Academy. If we increase it to four, it will add more than a half million of dollars, and if we increase it by two, it will add over a million dollars. I mention this so that you will have in your mind the whole picture as you think of the program that is before the country and is wrapped up in the broad phrase "the naval program."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Idaho has expired.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman one more minute. I desire to ask him a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Idaho is recognized for one minute more.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The question I would like to ask the gentleman is this, Is the gentleman trying to give this whole legislation the Job stab? The gentleman said he was in favor of the bill.

Mr. FRENCH. I am in favor of the bill.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. In view of what you have stated I would like you to show on what ground you are in favor of it.

Mr. FRENCH. You have limited me to one minute, and you control the time. I would gladly answer if I had the time.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I will ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania to give the gentleman from Idaho 10 minutes of the time allotted to the opposition.

Mr. FRENCH. You must not do that.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Is it not a fact that including the existing building program, which includes 18 cruisers, 2 submarines, and the 88 program down to the year 1932, which is already on the statute books, the total cost to complete that down to 1932 will be over \$270,000,000?

Mr. FRENCH. The gentleman is probably correct in the figures, but I have not added them up.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The items on the statute books to-day, including the obligations referred to, foot up the amount I have just stated, and the fiscal obligation is set forth in this bill amounting to \$272,000,000, which will be spread out over four years. This bill only deals with construction, and not maintenance. That is the reason why I stated what the construction program is.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] is going to allot five minutes more to the gentleman from Idaho from the time allotted in the check up for the opposition. Will the gentleman indicate if his cost of maintenance is based upon the passage of the bill now before the House? Can he give the figures showing how much it will cost if this bill were not approved?

Mr. FRENCH. I will say that the cost of maintenance is based upon the estimates of the Naval Establishment for 1929, and, as I suggested, this is taken as a minimum amount throughout the succeeding years.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. So that when these 15 ships get into commission we must bring in the cost of operating those ships?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] wanted to know, I think, why I am in favor of the bill.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. No; I think that is all right.

Mr. BLACK of New York. The Naval Affairs Committee has suggested the supplementing of the present program with the old authorization. Does your committee propose to do anything on the additional destroyers and submarines up to this time? The gentleman has told us what is to be in the coming bill.

I would like to know, if the gentleman would care to tell the House, whether he is appropriating for the existing authorizations as to submarines and destroyer leaders.

Mr. FRENCH. Oh, no; not at all.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield for one question?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. The facts which the gentleman has given the House and the country are the facts just as the gentleman finds them?

Mr. FRENCH. I hope they are. I have tried to present facts.

Mr. BLANTON. And his vote for the bill is an entirely different matter. It is a question of loyalty to the gentleman's chief?

Mr. FRENCH. No. The gentleman's suggestion brings me to the point which I wanted to take up when the gentleman from Georgia asked me whether, in view of the statements I have made, I would support the pending bill. In a word, although I had not planned to discuss that feature of the question, I will tell the gentleman in the first place that I think on the carrier question we can afford to build one carrier of the type proposed. We are way below the ratio in airplane carriers.

The *Langley* was an experimental ship; the *Lexington* and the *Saratoga* are so outrageously expensive and large that I doubt if we will ever consider such a type again. [Applause.] I think we ought to build the ship that is proposed to be authorized in the bill. Now, when it comes to the 15 cruisers my thought is this: We have to-day 10 cruisers that are first class; we have 8 that are building, and we have a larger number of cruisers that are obsolete. They ought to go out of service, and I want these 15 cruisers to replace the cruisers that are now in existence, and 6 of which are in service but which ought to be replaced by new ships. In short, then, in order to bring our Navy up to date, with ships that are new, that can render more efficient service than the old ones and that can better make a comparison with the cruisers of other nations, I am in favor of the pending bill.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. Is it not a fact that you and I have talked about this measure upon more than one occasion, and that we have consulted with each other not only upon the figures which my friend has presented here but also upon the desirability of increasing this carrier service?

Mr. FRENCH. What the gentleman says is absolutely correct, and he is the kindest gentleman in the world in consulting and trying to do teamwork on the program we are considering to-day.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. In the existing program, for which we are appropriating this year \$72,240,000, to complete that program will involve the total cost of the additions of these figures, which amount to \$201,561,450, if my additions are correct.

Mr. FRENCH. That is probably correct.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I am sorry not to have been here when the gentleman began his remarks. Has he supplied this information: Granting that this new program—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Idaho has again expired.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Idaho two additional minutes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The information I would like to obtain would be in response to this question: Granted that this new program is completed, what would be the annual maintenance increased cost on the Treasury?

Mr. FRENCH. That, I would say to my friend, would depend on several factors. Would you use these new ships as replacements? If so, I could fairly answer the question.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Well, approximate it either way.

Mr. FRENCH. Well, as I said, on each cruiser it would be approximately \$1,247,500 for operation and maintenance, and on the airplane carrier probably \$3,179,000. These are just estimates.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. What is the total?

Mr. FRENCH. Well, on that program it would run close to \$22,000,000.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Of increase?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. SPEAKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. SPEAKS. The gentleman is so familiar with this whole question that he should for the benefit of the Members who do not follow it so closely offer a word of explanation and apology for the unwarranted proposal originally made involving an expenditure of some \$750,000,000.

Mr. FRENCH. No. I am opposed to that program. I was opposed to it, and repeatedly said so in talking it over with the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee, whose attitude was the same as mine.

Mr. SPEAKS. Does the gentleman know how did it originate and why it was abandoned?

Mr. FRENCH. I do not know; but I am not responsible. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the members of the committee for their fine courtesy to me to-day. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Idaho has again expired.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE]. [Applause.]

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker. I shall support H. R. 11526, authorizing the construction of 15 cruisers and 1 aircraft carrier, but I wish to say that I would not have supported the \$750,000,000 building program recommended by the President and the Secretary of the Navy. The program they apparently favored was entirely too large for the present time, and I think the Committee on Naval Affairs should be congratulated for its action in reporting the present bill. Should the naval building program we have under consideration be authorized, I sincerely trust that there will be no destruction of the ships while they are in process of construction, or after they are constructed, as occurred after the Washington Limitation of Armaments Conference. At that time we scrapped 30 battleships and battle cruisers, with a total displacement of 755,380 tons.

Every normal-minded man who served in the military forces of the United States in the World War loathes and detests war, but being a normal-minded American citizen he realizes the necessity of being adequately prepared to defend and protect his country's long coast line and its vast commerce with the other nations of the world.

May I not remind some of my friends, especially those on the Democratic side, that President Wilson, in one of his public addresses declared—

It is the arm of force which must lie back of every sovereignty in the world, and the Navy of the United States must now be as rapidly as possible brought to a state of efficiency and of numerical strength which will make it practically impregnable to the navies of the world.

And I believe that the adoption of the naval building program proposed in the bill we have before us will bring our naval strength, both in numbers and tonnage, nearer to the ratio adopted by the Washington conference. At the present time the numbers and tonnage of modern cruisers built, building, and appropriated for, in the case of these countries, stand as follows:

Country	Number	Tonnage
United States	18	146,000
British Empire	63	386,636
Japan	33	206,415

In numbers of these modern cruisers, ranked in order of importance, the ratio stands to-day as follows:

British Empire	5.0
Japan	2.6
United States	1.4

In the total of their tonnage, ranked in order of importance, the following is the ratio:

British Empire	5.0
Japan	2.7
United States	1.9

If the 15 cruisers of 10,000 tons each to be authorized in this bill were constructed, even assuming that the British and Japanese were to abandon all present projects of further building, the situation would stand as follows:

	Number	Ratio	Tonnage	Ratio
United States	33	2.6	296,000	3.8
British Empire	63	5.0	386,636	5.0
Japan	33	2.6	206,415	2.7

These tables apply to cruisers. The construction of one aircraft carrier, as provided in the bill, will give us 78,700 tons, as against Great Britain's 107,550 and Japan's 63,300. In addition to this, Great Britain has one carrier more on her announced construction program, to be laid down in 1929. The aircraft carrier tonnage allowed each nation under the terms of the agreement reached at the Washington conference was United States 135,000, Great Britain 135,000, and Japan 81,000. So it is easily seen that the pending bill is not a competitive program. It only brings us up, if it does even that, to our quota

allowance. It is what we sought at the Geneva conference last summer.

To those who are against this bill, to those who want peace and who make the assertion that an authorization of this character will increase the likelihood of war, I wish to say that lack of adequate power for national defense will produce war and cause unnecessary sacrifice of the lives of thousands of men and needless expenditure of enormous sums of money.

We had at one time the opportunity to join in the League of Nations, but we preferred isolation and reliance on our own resources and ability to prevent war. Then there was the Association of Nations, which came to naught. Then came the Washington Limitation of Arms Conference which, as is so well stated in the Naval Affairs Committee's report, resulted in our sacrificing 30 battleships and battle cruisers. Another limitation of arms conference was held in Geneva last summer, but our proposals were rejected by the other nations participating in the conference. And speaking of the League of Nations, while it is not germane to the bill under discussion, I would like to call your attention to the opinion of Emil Ludwig, the eminent German writer, of the League and Woodrow Wilson. In his book *Genius and Character* he said:

Without your three years of proclamations and your brave six months of struggle, a League of Nations would never have been established. And even though it is still frail and has not admitted the important enemies of the Allies, it will soon exert a decisive influence upon its members, and within 10 years will be strong enough to delay overhasty actions like those of August 1 until an angry world has grown calm and amenable to reason. You have set up a new code—you alone in this era. You have formulated a secular goal, an aim which is at once practical and ideal, a beacon toward which the best minds and the youth of this continent may turn. And in the future, when the United States of Europe becomes a reality, people will call Woodrow Wilson its founder. For you were the first to convert the dream of poets and philosophers into a political program and to defend it with physical force.

It is to be hoped that the time will come when nations will cease to war, when war will be abolished by agreement among nations, but until that time does come it behooves us as lawmakers to provide that security and that defense to which this country is justly entitled. We owe it to our people. We owe it to the men and women of future generations. We do not intend to and shall not make of America a militaristic nation, nor do we intend to enter into a competitive building program with any other nation, but we do intend to provide that defense so necessary for the safety and security of the American people. [Applause.]

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have the privilege of now yielding to my friend from Ohio one minute. This is all the time the gentleman has asked for.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Chairman, I am gravely disturbed by this ambitious program [applause], especially in view of the possible increases which may come in the future. But I have not had the opportunity to give that critical examination of the plan which would justify me in speaking at any length upon it.

I desire, however, at this time, unanimous consent to have inserted with my remarks a statement prepared by the Foreign Policy Association of the relative strength of the United States Navy and other navies, which it is maintained is brought down to date, and more carefully prepared than any statement that has yet been presented to the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a statement made by the Foreign Policy Association, showing the relative strength of certain navies. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

RELATIVE STRENGTH OF THE UNITED STATES NAVY AND OTHER NAVIES
(Memorandum prepared by the Foreign Policy Association, 1226 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.)

The following tables have been prepared to bring out certain factors not contained in the condensed figures submitted in the report of the Committee on Naval Affairs (No. 834), but which are essential to an accurate comparison of the strength of the three principal navies.

As Admiral Hughes stated in testifying before the Naval Affairs Committee of the House, the age, size, speed, and armament of ships are equally as important as numbers and total tonnage. If a fair basis of comparison is to be arrived at, therefore, these factors must be given due consideration.

The tables appended to this memorandum are based exclusively on the data furnished by the Office of Naval Intelligence, United States Navy Department, and published as Document No. 183 of the House Naval Affairs Committee.

RELATIVE STRENGTH OF THE UNITED STATES NAVY AND OTHER NAVIES
BASED ON DATA FURNISHED BY THE OFFICE OF NAVAL INTELLIGENCE,
NAVY DEPARTMENT—INFORMATION AS OF OCTOBER 1, 1927

(House Naval Affairs Committee Document No. 183)

TABLE I.—C. L. light cruisers, first line (3,000 to 10,000 tons, 27 knots plus)¹

Country	Built		Building		Authorized		Total	
	Number	Tons	Number	Tons	Number	Tons	Number	Tons
United States.....	10	75,000	2	20,000	6	60,000	18	155,000
British Empire.....	39	190,000	14	138,000	3	26,000	56	354,810
Japan.....	21	116,000	6	60,000	2	20,000	29	196,205

¹ The figures in this table differ somewhat from those presented in the report of the Committee on Naval Affairs No. 834, presented Mar. 3, 1928, particularly as regards the number and tonnage of British and Japanese cruisers. The above report has apparently included in its table on page 3 several second-line cruisers for both the British Empire and Japan. These cruisers are comparable to the second-line cruisers of the United States, which are now obsolete, and should not be included in a comparison of first-line cruisers. They are not included in the Navy Department tables for October, 1927.

OTHER FACTORS AFFECTING COMPARATIVE STRENGTH OF NAVIES

The comparative strength of modern navies can not be based on numbers and total tonnage alone. Such factors as age, size, armaments, and speed are equally important, as indicated by the testimony of Admiral Hughes before the House Naval Affairs Committee, in arriving at a sound basis of comparison. The following tables and summaries provide additional data relating to these important factors.

TABLE II.—Age of first-line cruisers

Country	Number of ships	Year of completion	Present age
United States:			Years
Class—			
Omaha.....	6	1923	5
Do.....	3	1924	4
Do.....	1	1925	3
Pensacola.....	1	1926	
Salt Lake City.....	1	1927	
(Contracts for 6 more ships of the Pensacola class have been let and material assembled; keels have not been laid.)			
British Empire:			
Class—			
Comus.....	7	1915	13
Do.....	5	1916	12
Caradoc.....	6	1917	11
Coventry.....	7	1918	10
Hawkins.....	6	1919	9
Durban.....	1	1921	7
Despatch.....	3	1922	6
Frobisher.....	1	1924	4
Effingham.....	1	1925	3
Emerald.....	2	1926	2
(5 ships, Kent class, were laid down in 1924; 2 in 1925; 2 in 1926; and 5 in 1927.)			
Japan.....	2	1919	9
Do.....	1	1920	8
Do.....	4	1921	7
Do.....	3	1922	6
Do.....	3	1923	5
Do.....	1	1924	4
Do.....	3	1925	3
Do.....	2	1926	2
Do.....	2	1927	1
(2 ships were laid down in 1924; 2 in 1925; and 2 in 1927.)			

¹ Laid down.

TABLE III.—Comparative age of first-line cruisers

(The above figures may be grouped for convenience in the following form:)

Country	Building or contract let	Age (years)												
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
United States.....	8			1	3	6								
British Empire.....	14	2	1	1			3	1		6	7	6	5	7
Japan.....	6	2	2	3	1	3	3	4	1	2				

Thus, by the year 1931, when the conference for the limitation of naval armament convenes the oldest first-line cruisers of the United States Navy will be the 10 ships of the *Omaha* class, which will be 8 years old; the British Empire will have seven cruisers of the *Comus* class approaching obsolescence (16 years old), five 15 years old, and six 14 years old. Japan will have two cruisers over 14 years old and five which are more than 10 years old.

TABLE IV.—Size, speed, and armament of first-line cruisers
(No country has yet completed any modern 10,000-ton cruisers)

Country	Number	Armament	Speed
<i>10,000-ton cruisers building and authorized</i>			
United States.....	8	10 8-inch guns....	32.5 to 32.7 knots.
British Empire.....	14	8 8-inch guns....	31.5 to 33 knots.
Japan.....	8do.....	33.5 knots.
<i>9,750-ton cruisers, built</i>			
British Empire.....	4	6 or 7 7.5-inch guns.	30.5 knots.
<i>6,500 to 8,000 ton cruisers</i>			
United States.....	10	12 6-inch guns....	33.5 to 34.9 knots.
British Empire.....	5	No specifications	
Japan.....	4	6 8-inch guns....	33 knots.
<i>5,000 to 6,500 ton cruisers</i>			
Japan.....	14	7 5.5-inch guns....	33 knots.
<i>4,000 to 5,000 ton cruisers</i>			
British Empire.....	21	5 or 6 6-inch guns	29 to 30 knots.
<i>3,500 to 4,000 ton cruisers</i>			
British Empire.....	12	3 or 4 6-inch guns	29 knots.
Japan.....	2	4 5.5-inch guns....	31 knots.

¹ Great Britain has announced that one 10,000-ton cruiser will not be laid down for the present.

The foregoing tables show that the strength of the United States Navy in modern cruisers of 6,500 tons to 10,000 tons, built since the war, is only slightly inferior to the strength of the British Navy in the same classes of ships, and is considerably stronger than the Japanese Navy. The figures may be compared as follows:

Modern cruisers, 6,500 to 10,000 tons, built, building, and authorized

Country	Number	Tons
United States.....	18	155,000
British Empire.....	23	218,100
Japan.....	12	108,000

TABLE V.—Comparative strength in modern cruisers 6,500 tons to 10,000 tons in 1931 if the 15 United States cruisers requested in H. R. 11526 are authorized and appropriated for

Country	Number	Tons
United States.....	33	305,000
British Empire.....	23	218,100
Japan.....	12	108,000

TABLE VI.—Comparative strength in cruisers, first line, of all types, if the 15 United States cruisers requested in H. R. 11526 are authorized and appropriated for

Country	Number	Tons
United States.....	33	305,000
British Empire.....	56	354,000
Japan.....	29	196,000

It will be remembered that 12 of the small British cruisers will be obsolete within three years after the conference to be held in 1931.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I desire to yield five minutes to the lady from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS]. [Applause.]

Mrs. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, it is because I desire peace so much for our own country and for all the world that I want an adequate Navy as a part of our national defense in order to help make world peace.

I have stated before that I believe much of the hysteria against the naval preparedness program is due to a lack of understanding of what an adequate Navy really is. Perhaps the time will come when the world will be so well behaved that we shall need no policemen, but we shall have them to keep law and order until that time. If a policeman at the present time is too old or is disabled, he is replaced by an able-bodied man. This naval police program in large measure is one of replacements.

Have faith in the United States of America. I believe that our Americans will not want to fight other nations just because we have a few ships. I can not understand why some of the people in this country have so little trust in their own countrymen. We have never fought for any cause but a just one. We do not think in terms of war, but always in terms of peace.

As yet not much has been said about the policing of the Panama Canal and of the importance of an adequate naval force for the protection of the Panama Canal.

It is agreed by the best naval opinion in the country that if and when we ever become engaged in the emergency of war the great naval engagement of such a conflict will almost inevitably occur in the neighborhood of the Panama Canal.

The vital importance of protecting the Panama Canal at all times should be apparent to everyone. Aside from the strategic necessity during war of keeping the canal open in order to concentrate our fleet in the war area and to furnish necessary supplies to the fleet via the canal, the tremendous commerce that now passes through the canal to the benefit of the world is steadily increasing, and should not be stopped or hindered through any cause. During the year 1915, 1,075 ships passed through the canal, with a total cargo of 4,888,454 tons, while during the year 1927, 5,475 ships passed through the canal, with a total cargo of 27,748,215 tons, of which 15,242,156 tons of cargo were carried by 2,685 ships under the American flag. From 1914 to 1927 the net revenue surplus for all operations was \$79,953,875.53.

The following examples show at a glance the distance saved by vessels using the Panama Canal and the consequent tremendous saving in time, fuel, and money:

	Nautical miles—	
	Via Panama Canal	Route
(a) New York to—		<i>Via Strait of Magellan</i>
Acapulco, Mexico.....	3,443	11,524
Callao, Peru.....	3,363	9,613
Honolulu.....	6,702	13,312
San Francisco.....	5,262	13,135
Sitka, Alaska.....	6,564	14,437
Yokohama.....	9,699	<i>Via Suez Canal</i> 13,056
(b) Liverpool to—		<i>Via Strait of Magellan</i>
Acapulco, Mexico.....	6,017	11,891
Callao, Peru.....	5,937	9,980
Honolulu.....	9,276	13,679
San Francisco.....	7,836	13,502
Sitka, Alaska.....	9,138	14,804

Comparison of expenses, revenues, and surplus to date

CANAL TRANSIT OPERATIONS

	Tolls	Taxes, fees, postal receipts, etc.	Total transit revenues	Net canal transit expenses	Net revenues (surplus)
1914.....	\$14,618.68	\$14,618.68	\$186,030.91	\$151,412.23
1915.....	4,343,383.69	4,343,383.69	4,123,128.09	220,255.60
1916.....	2,399,830.42	\$158,711.96	2,558,542.38	6,999,750.15	4,441,207.77
1917.....	5,631,781.66	176,617.04	5,808,398.70	6,788,047.60	1,979,648.90
1918.....	6,264,765.71	147,077.57	6,411,843.28	5,920,342.94	491,500.34
1919.....	6,156,118.95	197,898.03	6,354,016.98	6,112,194.77	241,822.21
1920.....	8,493,082.59	442,789.01	8,935,871.57	6,548,272.43	2,387,599.14
1921.....	11,261,919.31	778,197.39	12,040,116.70	9,328,300.14	2,711,816.56
Total.....	44,565,500.98	1,901,291.00	46,466,791.98	45,986,067.03	480,724.95
To business surplus.....	480,724.95	480,724.95	480,724.95
1922.....	44,565,500.98	1,420,566.05	45,986,067.03	45,986,067.03
1923.....	11,193,383.47	192,208.85	11,385,592.32	7,919,017.63	3,466,574.69
1924.....	17,507,630.52	184,213.54	17,691,844.06	7,690,777.56	10,001,066.50
1925.....	24,289,603.16	392,250.73	24,681,853.89	8,373,905.39	16,307,948.50
1926.....	21,374,664.12	207,954.04	21,582,618.16	8,116,693.44	13,465,924.72
1927.....	22,927,456.03	217,680.50	23,145,136.53	7,993,468.47	15,151,668.06
1927.....	24,217,185.32	391,623.50	24,608,808.82	8,997,715.02	15,611,093.80
Total.....	166,075,423.60	3,006,497.21	169,081,920.81	95,077,644.54	74,004,276.27

CANAL BUSINESS OPERATIONS

	Business revenues	Business expenses	Net revenues (surplus)
1914.....	\$690,298.32	\$695,720.71	\$15,422.39
1915.....	2,135,074.92	2,191,475.70	\$56,400.78
1916.....	6,488,521.61	6,476,623.17	11,898.44
1917.....	7,579,588.44	7,540,160.78	39,427.66
1918.....	10,324,071.91	10,317,912.35	6,159.56
1919.....	13,684,881.18	13,623,833.92	61,047.26
1920.....	14,705,371.82	14,465,685.69	239,686.13
1921.....	15,232,317.08	14,668,105.88	564,211.20
Total.....	70,840,125.28	69,979,538.20	\$860,587.08

¹ Indicates deficit.

Comparison of expenses, revenues, and surplus to date—Continued
CANAL BUSINESS OPERATIONS—continued

	Business revenues	Business expenses	Net revenues (surplus)
Expense carried in transit operation above.....		\$379,862.13	¹ \$379,862.13
Net revenues carried to surplus.....	\$70,840,125.28	70,359,400.33	480,724.95
Interest on public works, Panama and Colon, etc., not included in net revenues in prior years.....	619,584.59		619,584.59
Adjustment status June 30, 1921.....	71,459,709.87	70,359,400.33	1,100,309.54
1922.....	7,747,227.57	7,423,968.41	323,259.16
1923.....	10,872,843.36	9,732,200.86	1,140,642.50
1924.....	12,968,777.29	12,067,153.17	901,624.12
1925.....	14,564,114.93	13,798,198.08	765,916.85
1926.....	15,874,478.01	15,033,167.72	841,310.29
1927.....	15,878,654.57	15,002,117.77	876,536.80
Total.....	149,365,805.60	143,416,206.34	5,949,599.26

COMBINED OPERATIONS			
	Revenues	Expenses	Surplus
Canal transit operations.....	\$169,081,920.81	\$95,077,644.54	\$74,004,276.27
Canal business operations.....	149,365,805.60	143,416,206.34	5,949,599.26
Total.....	318,447,726.41	238,493,850.88	79,953,875.53

¹Indicates deficit.

The following extracts are from treaties entered into by the United States with Great Britain and Panama regarding the obligation of the United States to maintain the neutrality of the Panama Canal.

Hay-Pauncefote treaty between the United States and Great Britain proclaimed February 22, 1902:

The canal shall be free and open to the vessels of commerce and war of all nations observing these rules on terms of entire equality.

The canal shall never be blockaded; nor shall any right of war be exercised nor any act of hostility be committed within it.

The plant, establishments, buildings, and all work necessary to the construction, maintenance, and operation of the canal shall be deemed to be a part thereof, for the purpose of this treaty, and in time of war, as in time of peace, shall enjoy complete immunity from attack or injury by the belligerents, and from acts calculated to impair their usefulness as part of the canal.

Again, the Hay-Bunau Varilla convention proclaimed February 26, 1904, provides:

The United States guarantees and will maintain the independence of the Republic of Panama.

The canal when constructed, and the entrances thereto, shall be neutral in perpetuity.

The above-mentioned treaties impose on the United States the moral obligation to defend the canal from all attacks in order to keep it open for the commerce of the world. No nations other than the United States, Great Britain, and Panama are parties to these treaties, and having no obligation regarding the neutrality of the canal would naturally be governed as the exigencies of war dictated. It is therefore essential that the United States have a strong naval force to insure that the neutrality of the canal be preserved. This is a definite obligation which the United States can not shirk. There is no possible excuse for us to shirk it.

In order to fulfill our solemn treaty obligation to maintain the integrity of the Panama Canal, adequate naval strength is necessary, and this was one of the impelling motives for recommending the Navy building program.

(A) NAVAL FORCES NOW BASED ON THE CANAL DURING PEACE

The United States naval forces now based on the canal are submarine divisions 8 and 18, consisting of nine submarines with one tug, and the Special Service Squadron, consisting of five old cruisers.

Submarine divisions 8 and 18 form an integral part of the control force which operates normally in the Atlantic Ocean and in the Caribbean Sea. However, these submarines base on the Atlantic Ocean and in the Caribbean Sea. However, these submarines base on the Atlantic side of the canal for training purposes and join up with the control force during the concentration exercises which are held every other year, but are not to be considered as primarily for the defense of the canal.

The Special Service Squadron is based on the canal on account of its proximity to probable revolutionary centers, and the

ability of those ships to reach disturbed areas quickly in either ocean by transmitting the canal.

(B) WAR BETWEEN TWO OR MORE FIRST-CLASS NAVAL POWERS, THE UNITED STATES BEING NEUTRAL

Assuming a probability that some nation contemplated a violation of the neutrality of the canal, the whole strength of the United States fleet could be quickly concentrated—so long as the canal is intact—and this concentrated fleet ready to operate in the zone of hostile operations would insure protection to the canal in direct proportion to the strength of this concentrated fleet.

A nation would find it profitable to violate the neutrality of the canal only when the advantages to be gained would outweigh the disadvantages of adding the strength of the United States to that of their enemy.

During the World War the Germans decided to wage unrestricted submarine warfare, only after they had carefully considered and discounted the effort that the United States would put forth. The fact that their estimate was in error caused them to lose the war.

The strength of the fleet considered now by the Navy Department as necessary to preserve our own neutrality and maintain the neutrality of our possessions is that proposed in the building program recently submitted.

It is considered that the local defense of the canal would in time of war be able to repel a small enemy naval force but not an army of invasion after it had landed in the vicinity of the canal. However, in any war in the Pacific with a first-class naval power the defense of the canal would best be assured by concentrating our naval forces in a strategic area at a distance from the canal in order to defeat his naval forces and drive back or sink his army transports long before they could reach our shores or the canal. The same strategy would undoubtedly be followed in any war in the Atlantic.

The President made the following statement in a speech delivered before the United Press at the Biltmore Hotel on April 25, 1927:

Toward the governments of countries which we have recognized this side of the Panama Canal we feel a moral responsibility that does not attach to other nations. We wish them to feel that our recognition is of real value to them and that they can count on such support as we can lawfully give when they are beset with difficulties. We have undertaken to discourage revolutions within the peaceful method of elections. This policy is bound to meet with some discouragements, but it is our hope and belief that ultimately it will prevail. This territory is rich in natural resources, and under orderly governments is capable of a development that will give to its inhabitants all the advantages of modern civilization. It is a curious circumstance that some of those who have been willing to have us take mandates over far-off countries in Asia, where we have no interest that does not attach to all humanity, are most critical when we are attempting to encourage the maintenance of order, the continuity of duly established government, and the protection of lives and property of our own citizens under a general reign of law in these countries that are near at hand and where we have large and peculiar interests.

The President in his annual message to the Seventieth Congress stated:

We have a foreign commerce and ocean lines of trade unsurpassed by any other country. We have outlying territory in the two great oceans and long stretches of seacoast studded with the richest cities in the world. We are responsible for the protection of a large population and the greatest treasure ever bestowed upon any people. We are charged with an international duty of defending the Panama Canal. To meet these responsibilities we need a very substantial sea armament.

Also, in his annual message to the Sixty-ninth Congress, he stated:

No self-respecting nation would neglect to provide an army and navy proportionate to its population, the extent of its territory, and the dignity of the place which it occupies in the world.

While we are doing our best to eliminate all resort to war for the purpose of settling disputes, we can not but remember that the peace we now enjoy had to be won by the sword and that if the rights of our country are to be defended we can not rely for that purpose upon anyone but ourselves.

The Navy Department has done its duty in recommending the naval building program, and to Congress is left the duty imposed upon that body by the Constitution of the United States and by the people of the United States. America must keep the faith and guard the Panama Canal with an adequate Navy. History will show if Congress has been found wanting. [Applause.]

Mr. MOREHEAD. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I want to go on record as opposed to large armies and large navies. I am

positive in my own mind they are the forerunners of complications and wars.

I think we are dealing at this time with one of the most important divisions of our Government. The proponents of this bill under consideration have not given up their program as originally planned to spend billions for an immense Navy, but the protests of the great plain people to such a program have changed the plans of the large Navy proponents to adopt more diplomatic methods. Hence the present bill to spend \$274,000,000 means only a beginning, to be added to at each session of Congress, as they believe the people will submit without protest.

When the present bill was under consideration on the floor of the House in the Committee of the Whole, the session had the appearance of a convention of the Army, Navy, and shipyard agents. Their principal argument in favor of the bill was that those who opposed it were pacifists. During the Spanish-American War and the World War those who were most accustomed to using the word "pacifists" when trouble started retired with all their blooded relations to a safe distance to keep themselves from becoming involved in any war measures, to reappear again when the fighting was over with the slogan "they had destroyed the enemy." Those same Americans were very vindictive against the administration for consenting to an armistice and the ending of the war, as they claimed, before the enemy was entirely annihilated. We who had our sons in the Army and who had contributed of our time and means were still branded "pacifists" when we sang and praised God that the war was over.

I have been a great admirer of the gentleman from Ohio, Senator BURTON, and I wished this morning that I had the power to yield to him my time. He has contributed a great deal in trying to find some way to adjust differences between nations without resorting to brute force. Mr. FRENCH, of Idaho, is also greatly admired by me, and I have followed him closely in the naval appropriation bills. I was pleased this morning with his arguments, but not altogether pleased with his findings.

Germany believed in preparedness and had the greatest army in the world. An ex-President, reviewing that army, said to the Kaiser, "With that army you could conquer the world." Germany tried it, but only met with defeat, because her preparedness was centered in her army.

I am for preparedness, but not along the lines of the proponents of the present Navy bill. My thought is to use the \$274,000,000 and, as fast as the revenue of the Government will justify, pay off the indebtedness, reduce the burdens of taxation, and adopt every method to have a prosperous, happy people instead of having our pledges discredited the world over. Make good the promises we have made and give the Filipinos their independence and let them work out their own salvation.

As has been stated, the present administration has been on all sides of the question at issue, and I can give no other reason, if it has been correctly stated, that the administration has folded its tent and silently stolen away, unless the money to be expended for this shipbuilding régime directly affects the immediate locality where their interests lie. The revenue bill passed during the session is held up on account, as stated by the powers to be, and the reason given that a reduction of \$66,000,000 of taxes on small business scattered all over the United States and who are financially embarrassed was too great a burden on the Treasury of the United States. To me such officials are not acting in good faith when they let the present Navy bill be passed without protest and turn down a small tax reduction on the small business.

Both sides of my family were pioneers to America, and some member of the family has participated in all the wars, including the War for Independence, and if I had the time and inclination to give the war record I probably would be arrested for carrying concealed weapons. [Laughter.]

America furnished for the World War as capable, courageous a lot of soldiers as ever faced an enemy, but it was not the soldiers alone that won the war, but America's credit, backed by the Treasury, that made it possible for the Allies to win. When America entered the war the credit of the leading nations then at war was exhausted and it was American soldiers and American credit that saved them. With all the cruisers we can build and with the prospect and outlook for the future in aircraft it will mean very little if the \$274,000,000 provided for in this bill is used in the extravagant expenditure for war vessels.

It will only be a few years until the boys who fought in Flanders Field will be controlling the destiny of this country, and I hope they will realize that the 150 years of peace that America, with few exceptions, has enjoyed was not perpetuated by large armies and navies but by attending to our

own affairs and treating other nations as we would have them treat us. [Applause.]

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELSH].

Mr. WELSH of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, as a Member of Congress coming from a great seaport town, a great industrial community, and from a district adjoining that of the chairman of the great Committee on Naval Affairs, I want to say a word of appreciation of the work of that committee on this bill. I wonder if the country at large realizes what constructive work that committee has done, and what a responsibility was imposed upon that committee in the preparation of this bill. This is the first time since the ending of the great World War that this, the richest and most powerful country in the world, has had an opportunity to face squarely the responsibility confronting it in the future and deciding on a policy as to how we are going to exercise the great power and the great wealth at our command.

We are to-day, for the first time since 1918, taking stock of the present and considering the future—deciding what shall be the policy of this great Republic in the future affairs of the world. This committee had the responsibility, first of all, of guarding and protecting American interests at home and abroad. They had then the even greater responsibility of protecting and cherishing the American ideals that have meant so much to the world in the past and which will mean so much to Christianity and humanity in the future.

As a Member of this Congress I am glad to know that the Naval Affairs Committee listened to all groups interested in this controversy. Also, I am glad to know that so patient and so fair were they that they have brought out a bill which, if submitted to the rank and file of our citizenship, I believe would meet with the honest indorsement of 8 men and women out of every 10 in the country. The only people who would be against this bill after learning all the facts would be the extremists on both sides, and this country can not be run successfully by extremists of any kind. [Applause.]

I consider that the Naval Affairs Committee have marked an epoch in the fixing of our national policy, and that they have done so after a sincere and honest effort to be guided by divine wisdom. I also want to pay a personal tribute to the chairman of that committee.

Mr. BUTLER. No; do not do it.

Mr. WELSH of Pennsylvania. Yes; I must do that, because I consider it my duty to do so. We have a committee here that is not a one-man committee. I know to my personal knowledge that the chairman of that committee has gone around to the various representative groups in the House by the score and has asked their opinion on this measure. When this measure was originally brought before the House, calling for an expenditure of nearly a billion dollars and 72 vessels of war, it shocked the entire civilized world. The country was brought face to face with a grave responsibility. We were asked to say to the world, in effect, that the great wealth and power of this country would be used for aggrandizement and commercial supremacy.

But, what has this committee done? It has protected every ideal of America, and we are now saying to the world, "While America will protect itself and all those things it holds dear, yet it seeks peace and not conquest or commercial supremacy at the cannon's mouth." We are saying to the world that while it is our duty to protect those things which we are called upon by God to cherish and to further—ideals of liberty, freedom, and equality—yet beyond this we will not go, and Christianity, not force, is the guiding star of the real soul of the American people.

I want to pay my respects to the chairman of this committee, as an individual. I think this is the greatest work that he has done up to this time. I speak as a man who loves peace rather than war. My people stand for peace and not war. We want peace, but we want it with sufficient protection to guard and shield those ideals for which that flag stands and for which the country stands.

If we were actuated by any motive of conquest or militarism a great naval expansion policy would have been agreed upon, which would have embarked this country upon a course which would have served notice on the nations of the world that power, not justice, wealth, nor principle, was to guide our actions in the future.

I want to thank every member of the committee for what they have done and to say that in my opinion this bill meets the approval of the fair-thinking people of our country, and I hope it will be adopted. [Applause.]

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, with its corners lopped off, this bill after all is the Navy Department's bill. It carries a new shipbuilding program of \$274,000,000. That is additional to the \$164,000,000 already authorized by Congress. Our distinguished friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER], whom we all love, consistent with the demands of his administration, to which he is loyal, has done the best he could, surrounded as he was by his committee of "big-navy" members. But if he could give the whole people of the United States a fair chance at this bill, and let them vote their sentiments, they would strike out its enacting clause and put an end to it.

I challenge the statement that was made here yesterday by our leader from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON] when, in defending Secretary Wilbur's presence on the House floor, he said that Secretary Daniels had appeared on this floor when Navy bills were up for passage.

Mr. TILSON. The gentleman is not quoting me. I said nothing about Secretary Daniels except upon information.

Mr. BLANTON. It was intimated here by our friends.

Mr. TILSON. The gentleman is mistaken. I did not say anything about him except as to what I was informed.

Mr. BLANTON. Our friend from Pennsylvania simply was mistaken. If Secretary Daniels appeared on this floor when Navy bills were under consideration, he did it before the war Congress, because I have been here constantly ever since March 6, 1917, when war was declared, and never at any time since I have been here did he ever appear on this floor when a Navy bill was under consideration. Oh, he has been here at the Capitol from time to time, as every other Cabinet officer has, but he has had the decency to stay off this floor when we have had his bills up for argument and discussion.

I am surprised at my distinguished friend from Illinois, Mr. BRITTON, who usually is a fair, square shooter. I am surprised, because he does not usually hit below the belt. Every stroke that he strikes is usually a fair one, but I was ashamed of him yesterday when during the honest, conscientious argument against this bill of our friend from New York [Mr. LaGUARDIA] he said that what he was afraid of and what the country was afraid of was what Mr. LaGUARDIA represented—communism and radicalism.

I have served with the gentleman from New York since the war started. I have never seen anything about him that was communistic or radical in the sense of disloyalty to our flag and Nation. No man has been more loyal. No man has been more patriotic. I do not agree with the gentleman from New York [Mr. LaGUARDIA] on many subjects, and I hate communism as much as anyone does, but no one may accuse the gentleman from New York of being a communist.

I saw him here vote for the draft act. I saw him stand here on this floor and without hesitation vote for the war-risk insurance act. I saw him vote for every necessary bill that placed in the hands of the President all of the resources of this Nation to win the war. And I saw him leave his seat in this House and don the uniform of his country in August, 1917 [applause], and while he was on the Italian front he faced death there from day to day, from week to week, and from month to month. I was ashamed when our friend from Illinois cast an aspersion upon him simply because conscientiously he saw fit to oppose this big naval program.

That is what comes from having Secretaries sit in our midst. That follows as a natural result.

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I am sorry I can not. I have but a few minutes. That follows from having a Secretary of the Navy sit within a few feet of the Speaker's stand.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for five additional minutes.

Mr. BLANTON. With a Secretary of the Navy seated here on a front seat, in front of the Speaker's stand, for two hours, and with an Assistant Secretary of the Navy seated in the gallery, and with admirals of high office seated there, watching the proceedings, would not you expect our friend from Illinois to cast some thrusts at men who opposed his bill?

I want to say this to those of you who approve Secretary Wilbur's presence on this floor: What are you going to do with the Caraway bill, which has been passed by the Senate and is now before this House of Representatives for consideration? That bill makes lobbyists register; it compels them to tell who they are, to tell what their connections and interests are, and what remuneration they receive for coming here and trying to

induce Members of Congress, the representatives of the people, to pass pernicious legislation. That bill makes it an offense for a lobbyist who does not register to say one word to you about pending legislation. Personal presence sometimes is more influential than words. What are you going to do with a bill like that, you who are in favor of a Secretary sitting here and by his presence helping to force down our throats legislation which the people of the United States do not want? Oh, you will have to throw that Caraway bill in the wastebasket. I challenge any Member of this Congress to show where that has ever occurred in the history of this Nation before.

I am glad that the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HUDBLESTON] had the good judgment to get up here and lodge his protest against that. He is a most valuable Member of this House. He stands for the people of this country. He knows that that practice is against good legislation in the interest of the people. I am glad, I say, that he had the good judgment to protest, and his protest had effect. There was a Cabinet meeting this morning, and your Mr. Secretary Wilbur was at that Cabinet meeting; and when those Cabinet officers got through and adjourned he decided not to come back here to-day, and he is not here now. If it was decent for him to be here yesterday, why is it not just as decent for him to be here to-day?

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. BLANTON. Well, I am bound to yield to the gentleman. I have to yield.

Mr. SCHAFER. The gentleman from Texas can not be here every day. The Secretary of the Navy may be like the gentleman from Texas. He may be making some investigations. [Laughter.]

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, I do not yield for that. I want to say that until the last few days—my colleagues will bear me out in that statement—until the last few days, when I had important business elsewhere conducting important official investigations, I have been on this floor constantly for the past 11 years. I have been seated there in that seat constantly, day in and day out, and I will leave it to my good friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] to say if there is a man who has sat here more constantly. Is there?

Mr. BUTLER. No; and there have been times when I wished you were not here. [Laughter.]

Mr. BLANTON. I know that, because I have felt constrained to oppose many of my friend's pet naval bills.

If the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HUDBLESTON] does not do anything else for the country beyond what he did yesterday to prevent a Cabinet officer coming here and thrusting his \$274,000,000 legislation down our throats, his service will be sufficiently valuable to justify the people of Alabama keeping him here until he has grandchildren, and they have grandchildren. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON]. He helped to write this bill, and he did a good many hours' work on it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, on this my first occasion to address this body since becoming a member thereof, I assure you it is with a feeling of real satisfaction that I rise to speak in support of a bill that does not contain any issue of a political character or any element of partisanship.

In the consideration of such a measure as this, the only purpose of which is to make proper provision for our national security and defense, there is no division among us along party lines. National defense and security do not admit of the usual party division based upon political considerations. In matters of this kind, party affiliations cease to exist as we each become members of one party—the American party—with no other object than to make certain and secure our national peace and tranquillity; and it is indeed gratifying to realize that this center aisle, which on so many occasions is a line of division between us, separating us in thought and action, becomes invisible.

What higher testimonial or what more convincing proof could there be of the common endeavor of the Members of this House to provide adequately for our common defense, or what could more clearly indicate the patriotic spirit of this House than the fact that every member of the Naval Affairs Committee—Republicans and Democrats alike, except one—has signed the committee report recommending favorable action by this House? And he who has not done so does not differ with his colleagues

in the desire to provide adequate security, but merely entertains a different opinion as to the kind and character of craft that should be built.

OUR NAVY AN INFLUENCE FOR PEACE

America is a peace-loving Nation and the Navy is its most potent and influential factor in promoting and maintaining peace and insuring its blessings to ourselves and those of the weaker nations of the earth who look to us for protection and security.

The primary purpose of the Navy is to maintain peace. It never declares war. That can be done only by the representatives of the people in Congress assembled; and, when war has been declared, the power of the Navy is used to reestablish peace at the earliest possible moment. Thus the Navy may properly be acknowledged as our country's greatest agent of peace.

Never in all the history of our Nation can it be said that the Navy has provoked war; but, on the contrary, time and again, its strength and influence have prevented war; and so long as the desire for peace is the aspiration of our people, that long will the Navy be an instrument of peace and not of war; and to give it additional strength will make more certain and secure our own peace and the peace of the world.

OUR NATIONAL AIM IS TO PROMOTE PEACE NOT WAR

It is difficult indeed to understand or explain upon any patriotic basis the attitude and activity of those individuals and agencies in our midst that are constantly endeavoring to create a spirit of distrust and suspicion toward the aims and purposes for which our country seeks to maintain its naval strength. These same individuals, however, have no difficulty whatsoever in understanding and even justifying the viewpoint of foreign nations and their right to build and maintain large and expensive navies; but when their own country seeks to provide the same means of protection and defense as already adopted by foreign nations, then it is interpreted by them as an unmistakable evidence of a spirit and desire upon the part of our Nation to provoke war. For instance the executive secretary of the National Council for Prevention of War, on January 25, 1928, sent broadcast throughout the Nation a letter seeking to create opposition to the naval program, and in which he used these words:

The issue is peace or war. This Navy program is a war program.

What could be further from the true purpose and desire of America? Individuals such as these either purposely refuse, because of ulterior motives, to understand the real spirit of America, or are unconsciously and inexcusably ignorant of the same. The most casual reading of our national history can not help but reveal to an honest and intelligent mind that this Nation has always been an advocate of peace and good will among the nations, and has constantly sought to avoid war and its distressing consequences. By precept and example abundant evidence of this fact has been given and so plain is our national desire in this respect that none should doubt.

If specific proof should be desired of our national desire to avoid war and remain at peace, what could be more convincing than our continued refusal for nearly three years to enter the great world conflict? We endured insult after insult. We saw American citizens, including innocent women and children, lose their lives by practices that would be hard to believe possible to exist or be permitted in this advanced age of civilization. We had rights challenged and denied, which had previously existed and been acknowledged by all nations. We had been treated as if we were a warring rather than a neutral Nation. To all of this we remained apparently insensible, refusing to become a party notwithstanding the severe criticism and firm conviction of many that we were thereby sacrificing our national honor. And, when at last circumstances beyond our control required our entrance into the war, we did so not merely to punish for wrongs done to us, justifiable though it would have been, but based our entrance upon the highest plane or ideal that ever in all the history of the world characterized the entrance of any nation into war, namely, "the peace of the world and the liberation of its people."

Notwithstanding the peaceful aims and ambitions of our Nation throughout the entire period of its existence, there are those in our midst many of whom are misguided by untrue and unpatriotic propaganda to which they have given full faith and credit who fear that should this naval bill be passed then it would be interpreted throughout the world as an intention upon the part of the United States to enter upon an aggressive policy, and that there could be no other result except to provoke a spirit of war. To sustain this view, they point to the World War as an example of the absolute certainty of war being a direct result of a Nation entering upon a naval building program and creating a military war machine as did Germany

prior to the war. They lose sight, however, of the spirit and the purpose that prompted the building.

We are told that for years the German militarists had drunk to the toast "Der Tag." Every act of preparation had the ultimate end in mind—Der Tag. Is it possible that anyone within the boundaries of this country, and especially those who claim citizenship herein, could be so unappreciative of the true spirit of America as to believe that any such warlike spirit dominates their fellow countrymen when their representatives in Congress merely seek to provide for our national security?

Nowhere in all the world is there a more pronounced and outstanding desire for universal peace than in America. Nowhere has there been a more ready and willing response to every effort that has been made to substitute peaceful means for the settlement of international differences rather than resort to military force. As a people we are justifiably proud of the fact that our Nation, above all others, has led in every movement to establish principles upon which international peace might be promoted. The peace of the world, made permanent and secure, is the sincerest desire of our people—an aspiration of the very heart and soul of America. It was for this that America shed her blood in 1917-18. What finer or more sacred contribution to the cause of peace could there be?

OUR EFFORTS TO ADVANCE PEACE SINCE THE WORLD WAR—VERSAILLES—WASHINGTON CONFERENCE—GENEVA

Never in the history of the world has there been a finer example of true, genuine idealism upon the part of any nation than that shown by the United States as it sat at the peace table of Versailles. Notwithstanding the fact that our resources of men and wealth had been the determining factor that finally brought success to the Allies, yet we neither asked nor received anything in return for our sacrifices of treasure and blood. As other nations strained and contested, openly and in secret, one with the other to gain advantage of territory or other worthwhile considerations, America stood aloof from the struggle and refused all material gain; but, with a quiet dignity and majestic spirit, sought only to advance the principles of liberty, true democracy, and justice as would most surely tend to the future peace of the world that those who died should not have died in vain.

WASHINGTON LIMITATION OF ARMAMENT CONFERENCE, 1921-22

In 1921 the strength of the United States naval forces—built, building, and authorized—had gained for our Nation the foremost position among the navies of the world. The great wealth of our Nation and its enormous resources were abundantly sufficient to enable us to easily maintain our position of superiority. Notwithstanding this, President Harding, through his Secretary of State, invited the Governments of Great Britain, France, Italy, and Japan to participate in a conference upon the limitation of armaments to be held in Washington on November 11, 1921. The invitation was accepted, and the conference was accordingly convened with general expressions of good will and friendship and apparent willingness upon the part of each nation to enter into the spirit of the occasion.

The deliberations of the conference, however, when stripped of all diplomatic verbiage, reveal the fact that the United States was the only nation that was willing to make any real sacrifice of existing naval strength. Our Nation, as an evidence of its sincere desire to promote world peace by the limitation of world armament, and in an effort to lead the way, agreed to a basis of maximum tonnage that necessitated the destruction upon our part of 30 battleships, having an approximate tonnage of 800,000 tons and an aggregate value of more than \$400,000,000. This act upon our part gave unmistakably evidence of the entire absence of any spirit of aggression or desire upon our part to be a dominating factor in world affairs or with ulterior motives to serve. No other nation taking a part in the Washington conference was called upon to make any such substantial sacrifice as that voluntarily offered by our Nation in its effort to promote peace. This contribution upon the part of the United States was made with the understanding that a ratio of naval strength should exist between the United States, Great Britain, and Japan on the basis of 5-5-3. This term arose by reason of each of these nations agreeing to limit the maximum tonnage of capital ships to approximately 500,000 tons each for the United States and Great Britain and 300,000 tons for Japan.

Notwithstanding, however, the apparent willingness of each of the nations signatory to the Washington conference to accept the basis of 5-5-3 as a proper ratio of naval strength, yet, unfortunately, it was not made a part of the agreement with respect to auxiliary craft, and consequently there was no definite agreement limiting any nation from building as many cruisers and other auxiliaries as it might choose. Yet when

Mr. Hughes presented the treaty to the last session of the conference, he said, in expressing the purpose and intent of those who were parties thereto: "This treaty ends, absolutely ends, the race in competitive naval armaments."

Since the Washington conference the United States has faithfully maintained the spirit of that conference, both with respect to battleships and every other type of war vessel. But, unfortunately, the other nations have not shown the same spirit to respect the purpose and intent of the treaty. In the six years that have intervened since the signing of the treaty Great Britain, Japan, France, and Italy have built war craft at a rate and to an extent that has been astounding to those who had supposed they were in full accord with the spirit of the Washington treaty. Since the signing of the Washington treaty in 1922, vessels laid down, appropriated for, built, and building, as of March 31, 1927, as compared with the United States, are as follows:

Country	Number of vessels	Displacement tons
United States.....	19	150,909
British Empire.....	37	285,795
Italy.....	46	102,207
France.....	96	221,828
Japan.....	116	339,201
Total.....	299	1,099,940

Shipbuilding of the maritime nations from 1922 to 1927:

Country	Number of ships	Gross tons
United States.....	18	195,191
Japan.....	75	333,327
Italy.....	87	711,499
France.....	104	630,613
Germany.....	192	1,118,635
Great Britain.....	882	4,905,853
Total.....	1,298	7,895,118

So that within six years after the signing of the Washington treaty the Japanese had a greater tonnage of modern cruisers built and building than had the United States, and the British had about three times as great. The extensive building program of each of the nations, as shown, would indicate that each of the nations parties to the Washington treaty, with the exception of the United States, has put into cruiser and other auxiliary construction the moneys Mr. Hughes's naval treaty had saved them from having to spend in building capital ships.

GENEVA CONFERENCE FOR FURTHER LIMITATION OF NAVAL ARMAMENT

In the early part of 1927 President Coolidge communicated with the Governments of Great Britain, Japan, France, and Italy regarding the further limitation of naval armaments. The President, in his message to Congress on February 10, 1927, with relation to his desire to promote such conference, said in part:

It has been the hope of the American Government, constantly expressed by the Congress since the Washington conference, that a favorable opportunity might present itself to complete the work begun here by the conclusion of further agreements covering cruisers, destroyers, and submarines. * * *

The American Government earnestly hopes that the institution of such negotiations at Geneva may be agreeable to the Governments of the British Empire, France, Italy, and Japan, and that comprehensive limitation of all types of naval armament may be brought into effect among the principal naval powers without delay.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I am weak when it comes to the gentleman from New Jersey, who has worked so hard on this bill. I am going to take the chance of offending some one else by giving him five additional minutes.

Mr. WOLVERTON. The invitation extended by President Coolidge for further conference on limitation of armaments was entered into by Great Britain and Japan but was rejected by France and Italy. It convened at Geneva in June of 1927, and finally adjourned without agreement the following August of that year. The purpose and intent of the United States in seeking by further conference an extension of the Washington treaty to include cruisers and other auxiliary craft and the mutual responsibility of each of the nations participating in the conference were very plainly set forth in the opening statement made by the Hon. Hugh Gibson, chairman of the United States delegation. He said:

Representing as we do the powers which now lead in naval armaments, it is appropriate that we should assume the responsibility for initiating further naval limitations. If we were not prepared to limit, we could not expect others to do so. * * *

Further, we can start with assured agreement on the following points:

1. That in the interest of international understanding there should be no competition between the three powers in the building of naval armaments.
2. That our respective navies should be maintained at the lowest level compatible with national security and should never be of a size or character to warrant the suspicion of aggressive intent.
3. That a wise economy in government dictates that future naval construction should be kept to a minimum.
4. That the methods and principles of limitation set forth in the Washington treaty are both practical and effective and should be extended to all categories of combatant vessels of the three powers.

Mr. Gibson, in the same statement, very clearly and definitely set forth the policy of the United States with respect to naval armament in these words:

Our policy with respect to naval armaments is guided solely by the desire for adequate defense. We have no intention of maintaining a naval force which could be regarded as a threat to any power. Neither have we any desire to initiate a competitive building program in any class of vessel which might influence others to lay down more vessels than they would otherwise consider necessary.

Pursuant to this policy, the United States is prepared to accept a general program providing for as low a total tonnage in each class of auxiliary vessels on the basis of the Washington treaty ratio as will be acceptable to the other powers here represented.

In an effort to definitely fix a maximum limitation in the cruiser and auxiliary class, in accordance with the principle adopted at the Washington conference in 1921, the United States proposed as a basis of discussion the following tonnage allocations:

Cruiser class:	Total tonnage limits
For the United States.....	250,000-300,000
For the British Empire.....	250,000-300,000
For Japan.....	150,000-180,000

At the present time the numbers and tonnage of modern cruisers built, building, and appropriated for in the case of these countries stand as follows:

	Number	Tonnage
United States.....	18	146,000
British Empire.....	63	386,636
Japan.....	33	206,415

There was, however, an absolute refusal upon the part of the British delegates to limit the cruiser class to a maximum of 300,000 tons, as requested by the United States, and the insistence upon their right to have a maximum of 600,000. Consequently, through no fault of our own Nation, the conference failed to carry out the object for which it had been convened; and this failure was the direct result of the refusal of Great Britain to accept the principle of parity which had been adopted at the Washington conference in 1921.

It is regrettable indeed that notwithstanding the sincere effort that has been made by the United States since 1922 to bring about a general limitation of naval armament among the leading nations of the world, such has not been possible of consummation owing to the opposition and unwillingness of other nations that must and should be a party to such agreements. It is impossible for the United States, however, acting alone and unsupported, to bring about either world disarmament or limitation of armament. Such object can never be attained until each of the nations of the world shall feel an equal responsibility and a corresponding willingness to act in conjunction one with the other.

CONCLUSION

Realizing full well the supreme desire of our citizenship to promote peace and harmony among the nations of the world, I can nevertheless without hesitancy, wholeheartedly and unreservedly, support this legislation now under consideration; for I am conscious to the fact that in no way does it violate, either directly or indirectly, the peaceful traditions of our Nation. As the American Navy in the past has never been other than an instrument in the hands of our people to foster and maintain peace, so with confidence I have faith in its future usefulness because I continue to have faith in the peaceful purposes of America. [Prolonged applause.]

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KVALE].

Mr. KVALE. Mr. Chairman, the Member from Massachusetts who took her seat a few minutes ago referred in rather caustic vein to the hysteria of the propaganda against this bill. I do not think she is justified in so referring to and so describing the work that some of us in this House and throughout the Nation are trying to do in opposition to the enactment of this bill into law.

If this work can be designated as hysteria, then there are no words and there are no terms in the English language with which I have any acquaintance that can adequately describe, I will not say the hysteria, I would rather be inclined to say the madness and the insanity that has characterized the propaganda in favor of this large Navy bill.

I have not a set speech and I did not rise because I think I can be instrumental in changing many votes in this House. I have no such illusion. I did not rise because I think I can add a great deal of information to the discussion, for I am not an expert along Navy lines. I rise mainly to put into the Record my opposition to this program, and I do so for fear I might have the same experience I did in the debate on the radio bill, when I asked for time during general debate and tried repeatedly to obtain recognition from the Chair under the five-minute rule and was successful in neither because of the large number of Members demanding recognition. In that case it did not matter much, because we were given an opportunity to register our votes on a record vote, but here I am very fearful that the votes in opposition to this bill will be so few we shall not even be able to have a record vote. For that reason I want to record myself in opposition to this naval program.

I am very sorry that this debate in many instances has been so acrimonious and intemperate. I know that there is sometimes occasion for being excited, and sometimes I become excited during debate. I do not so much object to the terms used in describing those opposed to the bill, but I do protest against the implications that have characterized the remarks of certain Members that we who can not go along on a large Navy program are less patriotic than those who favor it.

The gentleman from Texas has come to the defense of my good friend from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA]. I shall not repeat what he said, but I want to emphasize this fact: From my intimate acquaintance with the gentleman from New York for five years, I can truthfully say that he is as little infected with the virus of communism and bolshevism as is the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN], and I esteem them both. I say, the more names you call Mr. LAGUARDIA the more I love and admire him. [Applause.]

I know that we are called pacifists, but that does not worry me at all. I also know from history that the very term "Christian" was a term of opprobrium and shame for 300 years. And 50 years from now it may be that the term "pacifism" and all that it implies to-day may mean something widely different from what it does now.

I am not defending anything in Russia. The gentleman from Illinois knows, if he knows anything about me, that because of my adherence to the tenets of the Christian religion I can not possibly be in favor of the things that are being done over there.

I am opposed to war in any human way it can be averted, and therefore I am opposed to the enactment of a bill which I think is provocative of war.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. UPDIKE] said that we were being misled by the trash and propaganda that is being broadcast over the country.

Mr. UPDIKE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KVALE. Yes; I yield.

Mr. UPDIKE. Is it not true that they have been sending out literature, and are now doing so at this time?

Mr. KVALE. That may be; but I throw that stuff in the wastebasket.

Mr. UPDIKE. Does not the gentleman think that the people are being misled by it?

Mr. KVALE. Does the gentleman think that because some one is sending out that literature that anybody is being misled by such trash?

Mr. UPDIKE. I did not say that the gentleman was being misled, but the people generally.

Mr. KVALE. The gentleman used the argument against us and the implication was that we were being misled. If I am misled, it is not by this propaganda. I am a little older than the gentleman from Indiana, and those things do not affect me. If I have been misled, it is because I have read the New Testament, because I believe in the principles of the Nazarene, and I am not very apt to be misled if I follow Him. If Jesus of Nazareth was here to-day, how does the gentleman think He would vote? Would He be for or against this bill? I will yield to the gentleman to answer my question.

Mr. UPDIKE. He would be for the bill, because He would be for the defense of the country.

Mr. KVALE. Then I ask the gentleman to read the story of Jesus of Nazareth once more.

Mr. UPDIKE. I think I have read it perhaps as many times as the gentleman.

Mr. KVALE. That may be true; but it might interest the gentleman to know that I was ordained to the ministry about the time he was born.

You may call me a pacifist, but I am for an adequate Navy, a Navy for defensive purposes. I am for the retention of the Navy in its present strength. I think it is still too large; but if those who govern think it is necessary I would favor it until we can reach an agreement with other nations as to disarmament. But, I say, when in the name of reason do you expect to reach such an agreement with other nations if we adopt this program and continue to increase the present Army and Navy? Do not tell me that the people of the United States are back of this program. The metropolitan newspapers are back of it, but the people are not; and least of all the Christian people of the Nation. The gentleman speaks of a cross section being represented by the majority on the committee. I differ with the gentleman. The cross section of my country is against the program that we have before us here.

Why do we have to have such a large Navy of cruisers and battleships and what not? I tell you it is to protect foreign investments. That is what our Navy is being largely used for. We have now in foreign investments \$14,000,000,000, and the investments are increasing at an alarming rate. That necessarily means that we must increase the strength of our Navy to protect all these investments in every corner of the earth.

Mr. BRITTEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KVALE. Yes; I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BRITTEN. Is my friend opposed to the protection of American money invested abroad?

Mr. KVALE. I am not opposed to the protection of legitimate investments.

But here is the point. A great deal of this so-called property in foreign lands owned by citizens of the United States has been acquired by fraud and corruption, and the gentleman knows it.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KVALE. Yes.

Mr. BRITTEN. The gentleman, of course, is casting a very serious slur on American business. American business does not usually grow that way.

Mr. KVALE. I did not say all the investments, but I say a great deal of the property; and if the gentleman will investigate he will find out that is so. It was brought out in a debate which I attended at one of the universities in this city the other night. The reason I went in particular was because the question to be discussed was—

Resolved, That the United States should not protect by armed force capital invested in foreign lands, except after formal declaration of war.

And for the further reason that the affirmative was maintained by Carleton College in my own State. The three debaters were Heman Johnson, Rolf Lium, and Ben Duniway. The Members will recognize the second name as the name of the young pastor who served the President during his sojourn in the West on his summer vacation. I was wishing that the President had been there, because when this young man got up to speak—and they were three fine young men and excellent debaters—he did not criticize the President, and he so stated in so many words. Then the young man proceeded to rip wide open and tear to shreds and smash to smithereens the President's present program in Nicaragua. The gentlemen from Carleton especially emphasized the fact that much of the protection we are to-day giving to foreign investments is in reality protecting fraud and corruption.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KVALE. Yes; gladly.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Has it not been the declared policy of this country for over 130 years that when an American citizen invested money and went into business in a foreign country, he naturally had to submit himself to the laws of that country, just as any foreign capital invested in the United States must submit itself to the laws of this country?

Mr. KVALE. Certainly; and he has had the protection of the laws of that country.

There are several factors that enter into this program. They have been spoken of as the admiralty and the shipbuilders of the United States. The United States Steel Corporation is back of this program and Morgan & Co. are back of this program. I am not so sure but that it might be found on investigation that the United States Steel Corporation had something

to do with the fiasco at Geneva. They say that it is a replacement program. Then, how do you explain the fact that President Coolidge a little over a year ago had this to say:

No navy in the world, with one exception, approaches ours, and none surpasses it.

And in one year we have seen such deterioration that we now have a Navy, in some respects, about one-third as large as that of Great Britain, we are told. In the hearings—and I have read these hearings until 1 o'clock in the morning—on page 1681, I find the following:

The CHAIRMAN. I have not been able on account of physical reasons to sit during all of these hearings, but until yesterday I never heard a statement made that this proposed construction of 25 cruisers would replace or take the place of cruisers that we now have in service.

He repeated that and said:

I did not know that these ships would be for the purpose of replacement.

Mr. BUTLER. I stand by that.

Mr. KVALE. That ought to open the eyes of some people. We now hear about replacement. It is now replacement pure and simple, yet during all of this hysteria, this madness, this propaganda in favor of a large Navy, we have not heard about replacement until very lately.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KVALE. Yes; if the gentleman will give me five minutes more time.

Mr. BUTLER. Yes; of your own time.

I simply would not think of replacement with the miserable old tubs that the American Government now maintains and calls ships. I want good ships. I did say that I never called it replacement, I would not think of keeping such ships, I would not endanger human life by asking people to be on them.

Mr. KVALE. Then, according to the chairman, this is not a replacement program.

Mr. BUTLER. I do not know what it is.

Mr. KVALE. I am glad to have that information. Several others do not know what it is, but I know what it is. It is a program for war.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. KVALE. Will the gentleman give me five minutes more time?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes; he is entitled to it, if they have the time. But I say to the gentleman, he must not charge me with ever thinking that these ships hung up here last year are fit to have in the Government service or to think of putting human beings on—without smokestacks, some of them, and some of them without rudders.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania grant the gentleman five additional minutes?

Mr. BUTLER. I do.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Does the gentleman believe that any ships sailing the seas ever become obsolete?

Mr. KVALE. Certainly they do. That is one reason why I am opposed to this program, because before there is any possibility of any war they will all be obsolete and it will be money wasted.

Mr. WOODRUFF. That is ridiculous, and the gentleman knows it. Further than that—and the gentleman has made some extravagant statements—if he will inform himself, he will realize, if he believes that obsolete vessels should be replaced, that this is a replacement program and nothing else.

Mr. KVALE. I am glad that the gentleman, who is so well informed, tells us that. The chairman of the committee himself admits that he does not know what it is.

Mr. WOODRUFF. He will see that it is a replacement program, and not anything else.

Mr. BUTLER. If you give us new ships, why I would throw away these old ones.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Certainly, throw away the old ones.

Mr. KVALE. I beg of the gentlemen to let me have the floor.

Again, this is spoken of as being a preparedness program. I can not, with the best of intentions, understand how any intelligent human being can find it in himself to speak in favor of preparedness as a way to avoid war, after what he has seen of history throughout the ages, and after what he saw in 1914. That is to me a psychological problem. It seems to me that for all time, at least in our lifetime, we should be disillusioned in that respect and know that what Senator Sumner said is true. He said:

History teaches that the nations possessing the greatest armaments have always been the most belligerent; while the feeble powers have enjoyed, for a larger period of time, the blessing of peace,

Of course Senator Sumner was right, and, of course, this will tend to inveigle us into war. Germany and 1914 is the answer to that specious argument. And when they say we must be prepared, I ask, "What about our attitude toward Canada? How have we been prepared against a possible war with Canada, with 3,000 miles of border and only a few policemen there?"

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KVALE. Yes.

Mr. WOODRUFF. I think the gentleman might state, while speaking of the situation that has prevailed on the Canadian border for many years, that that position is the result of a definite agreement between us and Great Britain.

Mr. KVALE. Oh, very well. Then let us have the same kind of an agreement with the other nations. If we can have it with one nation, we can have it with other nations. [Applause.]

I ask, Whom they would expect to go to war with? With England? That is impossible. With France and Germany? They have not much of a navy. With Italy? Of course not. Our settlement with her proves that she is almost bankrupt. With Japan? She has not anywhere near the resources necessary for a war with the United States. One might be pardoned for waxing a little sarcastic and suggesting that some of our people must be expecting us to go to war with Switzerland, with its large navy! [Laughter.]

I make this appeal to you, my friends: Stop and think before you cast a vote for a bill of this kind. It is uncalled for. It is unnecessary. It is a waste of hundreds of millions of the taxpayers' money that might better be used for education, for roads, for farm relief, for flood relief, and a hundred other necessary things. And worse than all, it will be misunderstood and misinterpreted by our sister nations and tend to bring on war, that curse of civilization.

We already have an adequate Navy now for the protection of our interests in foreign lands, for the protection of such interests as warrant legitimate protection. We have an adequate Navy for defense purposes. If it shall be found necessary for national defense, bring in a program for air carriers and airplanes, and if that program is within reason I shall vote for it with enthusiasm, because everyone knows that if there is to be a future war it will be fought in the air and with airplanes, not with battleships and cruisers which are obsolete. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HUDSON].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I am a little loath to ask time to-day to speak on this program, for I am on record in my district and in my State as opposing the original program that was submitted by the Secretary of the Navy. I am going to make just these few remarks here, and insert in the Record, without taking the time of the committee, the reasons why I reached that conclusion, and why I think the country has reached the same conclusion.

However, to-day we are not confronted with the program that was laid out at the beginning of this Congress for an expenditure of \$740,000,000, with a program for 71 ships, and with the further consideration that did not appear on the program as launched, that it meant the expenditure of a billion dollars in the completion of that program. I am here to add my word of commendation, as that of a man who is looking toward amity between the nations of the earth—my commendation of the committee that has brought this present bill before us for our consideration. [Applause.]

I want to say to you that with the bill laid before them by the naval management of the Nation for that large expenditure, and seemingly upon grounds that were justifiable, this committee, after weeks of hearings and patient consideration of the needs of national defense, and also the needs of the taxpayers of the country and the needs of international relationship, has rendered a distinct service in bringing forward this program to-day; and I do not think there is a single person in the House who is not a fanatic but can vote for it.

Mr. KVALE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUDSON. No; I regret I can not yield. I am discouraged sometimes at what occurs on the floor in debate. There is nothing gained for national defense by calling any body of citizens in this country "pacifists." There is nothing gained on any hand by a group of Members attacking the Secretary of the Navy because he happens to take a seat on the floor of this House.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. HUDSON. Not at this time. I have only 5 minutes, and the gentleman from Texas had 15. If the gentleman gets me more time, I will yield.

I want this House, when it comes to a debate like this on a great question, to forget personalities and confine the discussion to the issue before it. It seems to me it is beneath the dignity of such a legislative body as ours. I am in friendship with my distinguished friend from Alabama [Mr. HUDDLESTON] and my distinguished friend from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] when I say to you that it lowers the dignity of this House when you attack the Secretary of the Navy when he sits on the floor, where he has the right to be.

What is the program before us? After weeks of consideration by the Committee on Naval Affairs, it is a program that can be called a program of compromise. And again I compliment the splendid senior Member of this House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER], for the weeks he has put upon this bill. I also compliment his associates. And I want especially to commend the member of that committee from New Hampshire [Mr. HALE] for the plea he made the other day. It was a plea for amity between the nations and a plea for peace. But it was also a plea that the defense of this country might be adequate for its people and its property. I am not afraid of this country going into war, but I do say that wherever the Stars and Stripes float the American citizen shall be protected in his life and property with every dollar that this Nation possesses. [Applause.]

Now, what is this program before us?

It is a program which provides for an annual expenditure for the maintenance of an adequate Navy over a period of six years. It breathes in no way of bombast or false superiority. It can not be taken as an offense against the amity of the nations. It can safely be called a program of a peace-loving and peace-seeking nation in maintaining her line of just defense. It provides what? It provides an authorization for the construction of 15 light cruisers with 8-inch guns and 1 aircraft carrier, a total of 16 vessels, at an outlay of \$274,000,000. Contrast that program before us as a Committee of the Whole with the program that seemed to confront us in the beginning of this Congress. It is an authorization for the construction of 16 vessels instead of 71 vessels. That goes a long way in giving in to the demands of this country for peace and for amity among the nations.

Mr. KVALE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUDSON. Yes.

Mr. KVALE. Does the gentleman think that they ever expected to get the 71?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes; they did and more, too. I can answer the gentleman.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. HUDSON. Let me answer one at a time. I would suppose they expected to get that as much as they would expect to get any bill that they proposed to this House; in fact, from the nature of the naval set-up they had a right to demand 71 vessels, and I would suppose they could use them. However, I do not think the temper of the country would have allowed that construction, and this committee yielded to the temper of the country by bringing in a sane and wise program.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman now yield?

Mr. HUDSON. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. I want to ask my friend if the people of Lansing and the State of Michigan do not expect the Secretary of the Navy to run the Navy, and if they do not expect my friend from Michigan and his 434 other colleagues to run this House of Representatives without Secretary Wilbur's interference?

Mr. HUDSON. No; I would not say they would expect that. Mr. SCHAFER. Will the gentleman yield to me so I may clear up this matter?

Mr. BLANTON. Then the gentleman ought to remain in Lansing and let the Secretary of the Navy vote his vote.

Mr. HUDSON. Let me answer the gentleman. The people of my home city, sir, would expect that every Cabinet officer shall have the rights and privileges of this floor at any time and at all times.

Mr. BLANTON. Socially, yes.

Mr. SCHAFER. Will the gentleman yield to me now?

Mr. HUDSON. I am not so sure but what it was a wise thing.

Mr. BLANTON. Socially, yes.

Mr. HUDSON. I am not so sure but what it was a wise thing for the Secretary to come here and find how Congress feels about the matters which they control, and in that way they can probably find out something to their advantage.

Mr. BLANTON. We are learning how they in the Navy feel slowly but definitely.

Mr. SCHAFER. Will the gentleman yield to me so that I may clear this up?

Mr. HUDSON. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin want to answer the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. SCHAFER. Yes.

Mr. HUDSON. Then I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SCHAFER. I would suggest that you answer the gentleman from Texas by telling him that the Members of Congress should run the Congress and not try to run the police department of the District of Columbia. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. The Constitution requires us to do that. I have not taken any of the gentleman's perquisites away from him.

Mr. HUDSON. Gentlemen, I have a prepared address here which I would have liked to have gotten out of my system, but this is not the kind of a day to do it. However, I want to call your attention, and the attention of those who seem to be opposed to this bill, to section 4, which is placed in the bill in direct consideration of the gentlemen that my friend from Minnesota and I are joined with.

When you speak of pacifists I imagine they put me on the same ground, for I try to follow the teachings that you, sir, were saying you were following. But we must remember, sir, that while the Master sent His disciples out once two by two, without scrip or wallet, the next time He sent them out He told them to be prepared.

Mr. KVALE. With guns?

Mr. HUDSON. So there is in the teachings of that Man, after whom I want to shape and fashion my life, the teaching that we render unto Caesar the things that belong unto Caesar, and there is, of course, the necessity of a nation having its adequate and its natural defenses. But in this section the committee has yielded to the demand over the world for peace.

If we read the morning papers, we saw what the Secretary of State at a meeting last night in New York City said. Does that look as though we were headed toward war? Does that look as though we were headed toward international strife?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman one minute more.

Mr. HUDSON. I want you to take into consideration section 4, which says that in the event of an international agreement for further limitation of naval armament the President is authorized and empowered to suspend in whole or in part this entire program. We are not raising something here that can stop peace between the nations of the earth. We are for world peace. We want world peace, and the committee has brought before us in this provision the grounds upon which we can continue our counsels for world peace, and we are going to do it. [Applause.]

There is no reason to-day why we should not vote for this bill in the way the committee has brought the bill before us.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Chairman, the failure of the Geneva three-power naval conference of the summer of 1927 to agree on the ratio of naval vessels outside of the limitation of the Washington Disarmament Conference, led immediately to the launching of a propaganda throughout the country for a great naval-building program. The word was sent forth by our Navy Establishment and various auxiliary organizations that England was building a huge navy and therefore we must immediately launch a similar program.

If this was not done, we would find ourselves with a very inferior fleet and personnel in 1936.

The proponents of this program said the Nation was rich; that it was the world power to-day, and that our dignity and ability demanded the greatest Navy of any power anywhere in the world.

This discussion and propaganda, fed by the Navy League, the admirals, and other organizations, made a setting for the bill introduced in the House on December 14, 1927, as submitted by the Secretary of the Navy.

This bill called for the construction of the following naval vessels: 25 cruisers, 9 destroyer leaders, 32 submarines, 5 aircraft carriers, a total of 71 vessels, estimated to cost \$740,000,000, but which would have reached into \$1,000,000,000. While the bill did not call for a definite period of years in which the program was to be completed, the press of the country carried the impression to our citizenry that it was a program to be completed within five or six years.

Secretary Wilbur stated before the committee that the General Board, in the preparation of the program submitted primarily was considering the needs of the national defense, but added:

It is true in determining this need the General Board has at all times taken into consideration other nations and their construction program.

In other words, in the language of the Secretary, expressing the views of the General Board, the matter of a competitive building program for the Navy was one of the objects to be accomplished by the bill introduced.

Now, let us see what effect this would have upon the public in general, who had been led, by the President's message to Congress in their opening sessions of 1926 and 1927, to believe that the defenses of this Nation were in fair order. I want to quote you first in substantiation of that statement from the President's message to the two Houses of Congress at the beginning of the second session of the Sixty-ninth Congress, delivered in December, 1926. Under the subhead of national defense I quote:

Our policy of national defense is not one of making war, but of insuring peace. The land and sea force of America, both in its domestic and foreign implications, is distinctly a peace force. It is an arm of the police power to guarantee order and the execution of the law at home and security to our citizens abroad. No self-respecting nation would neglect to provide an army and navy proportionate to its population, the extent of its territory, and the dignity of the place which it occupies in the world. When it is considered that no navy in the world, with one exception, approaches ours and none surpasses it, that our Regular Army of about 115,000 men is the equal of any other like number of troops, that our entire permanent and reserve land and sea force trained and training consists of a personnel of about 610,000, and that our annual appropriations are about \$680,000,000 a year, expended under the direction of an exceedingly competent staff, it can not be said that our country is neglecting its national defense. It is true that a cult of disparagement exists, but that candid examination made by the Congress through its various committees has always reassured the country and demonstrated that it is maintaining the most adequate defensive forces in these present years that it has ever supported in time of peace. Particular points may need strengthening, but as a whole our military power is sufficient.

The one weak place in the whole line is our still stupendous war debt. In any modern campaign the dollars are the shock troops. With a depleted treasury in the rear, no army can maintain itself in the field. A country loaded with debt is a country devoid of the first line of defense. Economy is the handmaid of preparedness. If we wish to be able to defend ourselves to the full extent of our power in the future, we shall discharge as soon as possible the financial burden of the last war. Otherwise we would face a crisis with a part of our capital resources already expended.

While our policy of national defense will proceed in order that we may be independent and self-sufficient, I am opposed to engaging in any attempt at competitive armaments. No matter how much or how little some other country may feel constrained to provide, we can well afford to set the example, not of being dictated to by others, but of adopting our own standards. We are strong enough to pursue that method, which will be a most wholesome model for the rest of the world.

The foreign policy of this Government is well known. It is one of peace based on that mutual respect that arises from mutual regard for international rights and the discharge of international obligations. It is our purpose to promote understanding and good will between ourselves and all other people. The American people are altogether lacking in an appreciation of the tremendous good fortune that surrounds their international position. We have no traditional enemies. We are not embarrassed over any disputed territory. We have no possessions that are coveted by others; they have none that are coveted by us. Our borders are unfortified. We fear no one; no one fears us. All the world knows that the whole extent of our influence is against war and in favor of peace, against the use of force and in favor of negotiation, arbitration, and adjudication as a method of adjusting international differences.

Here you have a Nation whose Executive, Commander in Chief of its Navy, had said within the 12 months previous that "No navy in the world, with one exception, approaches ours and none surpasses it," confronted with a building program of 71 vessels of defense costing \$1,000,000,000.

What was the average citizen and taxpayer to think?

These average citizens were further told by their President at the beginning of 1927 in a special message to Congress:

The American Government and people are convinced that competitive armament constitutes one of the most dangerous contributing causes of international suspicion and discord and are calculated to eventually lead to war.

Could anyone expect anything else than that the average citizen and taxpayer, after those words by his President, should be alarmed and incensed at the program thrust before us at the opening of Congress.

And would that sentiment not be further increased by the very words used in the President's message sent to the two Houses of Congress at the beginning of the first session of this Congress.

In that message of last December, under the title of national defense, the President addressed Congress as follows:

Being a Nation relying not on force but on fair dealing and good will to maintain peace with others, we have provided a moderate military force in a form adopted solely to defense.

Continuing he said, speaking of the Navy now:

We can plan for the future and begin a moderate building program.

Could the people understand that 71 vessels and seven hundred and forty millions of expenditures was a moderate building program when it was understood especially that this expenditure should be within a five or six year period?

I quote again from the same message on the same subject:

The failure to agree—

Referring to the Geneva conference—

should not cause us to build either more or less than we otherwise should. Any future treaty of limitation will call on us for more ships. We should enter on no competition.

Again he says:

It should especially be demonstrated that propaganda will not cause us to change our course. Where there is no treaty limitation, the size of the Navy which America is to have will be solely for America to determine. No outside influence should enlarge it or diminish it.

The duty of this Congress is to provide for the increase of the Navy up to the point where it may be kept intact in its present strength. Beyond that we have no right to go, either in the expenditure of money or in inciting other nations to rush into lavish constructive programs. We are convinced, in spite of lurid statements by certain organizations and men, that the American people are opposed to naval expansion merely for the purpose of competing with other nations.

While we were discussing the pending bill on the floor yesterday, Secretary of State Kellogg was speaking to the Foreign Relations Council in New York, in the course of which he said:

The United States has been a party to conciliation treaties for 15 years, and while there has never yet been an occasion for invoking them, I know of no reason why this country should object to an inquiry by a commission of conciliation if war is threatened. It is claimed in some quarters that purely domestic questions might be inquired into by these commissions of conciliation. While I can not conceive that any government would feel justified in demanding an inquiry by the commission into a matter solely within the domestic jurisdiction of another government, I do not feel that the point is material. The object which is sought to be attained by conciliation treaties is the prevention of war, and in my opinion any government can well afford to submit to inquiry any question which may threaten to involve it in the horrors of war, particularly when as in the Bryan and other treaties I have just mentioned, the findings of the commission have no binding force and to be effective must be voluntarily accepted.

The world is more and more alive to the necessity of preventing war, and I think it is significant that the Sixth International Conference of American States which recently concluded its labors at Habana adopted two antiwar resolutions, one of which contains the unqualified statement that "the American Republics desire to express that they condemn war as an instrument of national policy in their mutual relations."

We could not very well approve of the original Navy program with those words in our ears.

Now, after many weeks of hearings in consideration by the committee they have laid before us their reaction in the form of the present bill.

We desire at this point to commend the honored chairman, Mr. BUTLER, of Pennsylvania, and members of the committee for the moderation and saneness which they have revealed in submitting for our consideration the present bill and the report accompanying it.

The program is one which can safely be called a program of moderation, a program of meeting the actual needs for the maintaining of an adequate Navy. It breathes in no way of bombast or false superiority. It can not be taken as an offense against the amity of the nations.

It can safely be called a program of a peace-loving and peace-seeking nation in maintaining their line of just defense.

It gives authorization for its construction program of 15 light cruisers of 8-inch guns, 1 aircraft carrier, a total of 16 vessels, at an outlay of \$274,000,000.

So our program that is to be considered is not one of 71 vessels and \$740,000,000, but one of 16 vessels and \$274,000,000.

A program not of excessive expenditure or a race in tonnage with other nations, but it is a program of replacement and stabilization.

I want you to take into consideration section 4, which says that in the event of an international agreement for further limitation of naval armament the President is authorized and empowered to suspend in whole or in part this entire program. We are not raising something here that can stop peace between the nations of the earth. We are for world peace. We want world peace, and the committee has brought before us in this provision the grounds upon which we can continue our counsels for world peace, and we are going to do it.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOYLAN].

Mr. BOYLAN. Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the committee, it is all right for a gentleman [Mr. KVALE], who lives about 1,500 miles from the seaboard and who has a cyclone cellar to enter in case of an emergency, to get up here on the floor and say that we should keep our Navy only up to the standard that is necessary for defense. The gentleman says he is in favor of Navy for defense only. Where are you going to draw the line of demarcation between defense and offense? I am sure it would be very difficult for one to draw that line.

And, again, about replacements; the gentleman, I believe, is a crackjack farmer. I think he yields to no one in this House as a farmer, and yet if he had a tumble-down barn he would not replace it with another tumble-down barn, would he? Why, certainly not. He would want a barn that had every modern equipment and was right up to the minute.

On the same theory we should replace old, worn-out ships with new, modern ones.

I am with our respected and beloved colleague, the former Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], in a desire for universal peace. I would say God speed the day when the nations of the earth agree upon universal peace; but, gentlemen, that hour has not yet arrived and we must use the means at our command to carry on.

There is only one objection I have to the bill before us, and that is it does not go far enough, because, after this program is completed, what will be our position at that time? I will just read the conclusion of the committee in their report:

The foregoing program is intended to so round out our naval forces as to make them reasonably competent to support our policies and safeguard our interests throughout the world. Its purpose is to insure that these policies and interests will be respected and peace maintained. It is in no sense a competitive program, since the essence of competition is the effort to excel or outdistance another. The program when completed will still leave our Navy in a secondary position.

I know we did a very foolish thing after the Washington conference. We scrapped splendid war vessels that were ready for service and were worth while, whereas the other parties to the contract scrapped beautiful sets of blue prints. Now, surely the gentlemen do not want to have that same thing repeated at this time. It is little enough for us to have a building program that will bring us up to the 5-5-3 ratio. This bill does not even do that.

We have had gentlemen here in this House—and I do not know whether they are licensed or not—yet they posed here as crystal gazers and as psychics. Under the regulations of the District I understand that crystal gazers and psychics must take out a license in order to practice, and yet men have deliberately within the last two days stood on the floor of this House and used the prerogatives of these crystal gazers and psychics by telling us that it will be impossible for us ever to have war with England, Japan, France, or Italy. I purpose, gentlemen, to offer a motion or resolution in the House that no Member be permitted to exercise the business of forecasting or foretelling events unless he is properly and duly accredited on the license books of the District of Columbia. [Laughter.]

Mr. KVALE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOYLAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. KVALE. Then what about the gentlemen who are continually forecasting war?

Mr. BOYLAN. That is what I am saying. I say I am opposed to any forecasters holding forth here without a license, either predicting war or saying it is impossible to have war. [Laughter.]

Mr. KVALE. I understood that applied only to those who said it was impossible to have war.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. BOYLAN. What we ought to do is to keep our Navy right up to the minute, and keep it up not beyond the ratio that has been established, but keep it up to that ratio.

I am sure even the gentlemen who are opposed to this bill would regret very, very much if one of our seacoast towns, either on the Atlantic or the Pacific, were bombarded by an enemy. They would say then, if they could, they would be willing to use every resource and every help in their power in order to help their brethren.

One of the gentlemen says, "Oh, I am for airplanes and I am for all sorts of air machines rather than for new ships."

Mr. McKEOWN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BOYLAN. Yes.

Mr. McKEOWN. The gentleman would not believe in applying the principle of a 20 per cent contribution for the defense of cities on the coast, as is proposed in defending us against the floods of the Mississippi River.

Mr. BOYLAN. Well, that is a different proposition. I would be pleased to give you all the help you need. I am willing to go the whole way with you and without asking for a 20 per cent contribution from you.

But speaking about airplanes, one of the gentlemen states that he is in favor of airplanes. That is all right, but they have not reached the stage of development yet where they can take off of themselves. They need mother ships, they need protecting cruisers, and we have to have these aids for them in order that they be of any service at all.

Gentlemen, we ought to keep our fighting forces right up to the minute. We should not only adopt a building program, a well-balanced one, but we should also keep all our navy yards fully manned and equipped to carry on at a moment's notice should necessity demand it.

If we do this, our Navy will not be a menace to the world; it will be a most effective agency for the preservation of peace. [Applause.]

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, while it may be that I can not add anything either to the facts or arguments which have already been presented in support of this measure, I feel it my duty to voice my views on the subject in the hope that it may serve to emphasize what has already been said.

In determining whether or not Congress should authorize this building program, it is important at the very outset to ascertain what is the mission of the American Navy.

The primary duty imposed upon it is to afford protection and defense to the United States—the home land—from invasion or conquest.

In addition to that important duty, it must at all times be ready to defend our far-flung insular possessions; to maintain for American commerce the freedom of the seas; to afford and guarantee adequate defense to the greatest engineering enterprise and commerce carrier of the century, the Panama Canal; to maintain our policies in the Orient; to enforce our policies of noninterference by monarchical governments in Central and South American Republics; and to defend our national honor and protect and redress American citizens whenever wronged.

We are the richest nation on earth; we are the greatest export nation on the globe; our trade routes extend to every ocean; our coast line does not only embrace the coast line of the United States but under our Monroe doctrine the coast line of every country of Central and South America becomes our coast line.

As long as we are dependent upon the Chilean nitrate fields for nitrates from which explosives are manufactured, that route of trade must ever remain impregnable; our communications with our insular possessions, with the Hawaiian Islands, the Philippine Islands, and Porto Rico, thousands upon thousands of miles from the home land, must be uninterrupted.

Therefore such a naval mission as I have briefly outlined requires that this Government at all times maintain a Navy in the highest state of efficiency, and that it be so balanced—consisting of different types of ships—that it will be able at any moment to meet any emergency that might confront the Government.

If there is one policy firmly fixed in the minds of the people of this country, it is that they are opposed in times of peace to a large standing army. But knowing that the Navy is the first line of our national defense the American people have always stood for a program—of whatever character it may be—for a Navy of sufficient strength and so balanced and proportioned that it will be in readiness at any and all times to meet any and all national emergencies.

Mr. CONNERY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I will.

Mr. CONNERY. If the gentleman and members of the committee feel that way, why did not the committee give us what President Coolidge asked for—a real Navy?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Because in our judgment we are giving you all the naval mission required. In our judgment the naval mission did not require what the President recommended. If it did require it I would be standing here and advocating it. After examining the naval needs of the country we concluded that the program that we present here meets the naval needs at this time. [Applause.]

It is absolutely essential that our Navy be in condition and prepared at all time. It must ever remain in a state of readiness, for in the event of national emergency it can not wait to be prepared, but must be prepared at the time to cope with the emergency.

The naval mission to which I have referred requires that this Government maintain a strong Navy. The primary duty of government is self-preservation, and no sophistry of logic can justify it in stripping itself of its means of defense and relying for its preservation upon the mercy, the pity, or the love of other nations.

Mr. Chairman, at the Washington conference it was proposed by this Government that the same ratio applicable to battleships be extended to include cruisers, destroyers, and submarines.

That proposal submitted by our Government was not accepted by the other powers, who propose to retain unlimited discretion in the building of this type of vessels.

Since the Washington conference it has at all times been the hope of this Government that an agreement could be reached with the other maritime nations with reference to a limitation on cruisers, destroyers, and submarines.

Therefore, as you will all remember, the President requested the five nations signatory to the Washington treaty to meet at Geneva for the purpose of seeing if limitation could not be secured. England and Japan accepted the invitation.

In his opening statement to the conference Mr. Gibson, the American representative, stated:

Our respective navies should be maintained at the lowest level compatible with national security and should never be of a size or character to warrant the suspicion of aggressive intent.

For the purpose of bringing about a genuine limitation of naval armament he proposed to the conference that the total tonnage limitation for cruisers for the United States should be 250,000 to 300,000 tons, and the same for the British Empire, and 150,000 to 180,000 tons for Japan.

It is to be deeply regretted that the other nations at the conference could not agree to the American proposal.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I will.

Mr. WOODRUFF. As a matter of fact, the amount of tonnage we will have as a result of the building program is the amount of the tonnage stated by Mr. Gibson at Geneva as the basis of the discussion.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Of course. If this program goes through, we have to-day 144,000 tons of cruisers, and adding the 150,000 proposed at Geneva makes 294,000 tons of cruisers, which was the proposal at Geneva at that time to meet our mission in the event of a compromise with 300,000 tons.

The building program now before you for consideration is the same proposal that was submitted at Geneva by this Government. If that proposal had been agreed to as submitted, we would have been authorized to build 15 additional cruisers of 10,000 tons each, or an additional tonnage of 150,000 tons.

We now have built, building, and authorized 18 cruisers of a total tonnage of 144,000 tons. Add to this tonnage the 150,000 tons proposed at Geneva, and provided for in this bill, and it will give us a total tonnage of 294,000 tons.

Surely if the proposed agreement had been reached no one would object to the Government building the tonnage agreed upon. Having failed to reach an agreement, we are not asking that any more tonnage in cruisers be authorized at this time than was proposed at the conference.

This building program is nothing more or nothing less than the straight proposal submitted at Geneva.

This Nation has never engaged in competitive building and does not intend to do so. The program we are presenting is in no sense competitive, but is based entirely upon the needs of our Navy to enable it to meet, in case of a national emergency, the mission for which it is built and maintained.

We are not asking this House to build the 15 additional cruisers for the reason that Great Britain has 63 cruisers and Japan 33. We are asking the approval of this measure because

the mission of the Navy to which I have referred demands these additional ships, and it more nearly affords the Nation the security to which it is entitled.

Inquiry concerning the strength of other naval powers is always germane to the question, so let us see what is the cruiser strength of other nations. In modern cruisers of all caliber, Great Britain has built and building 63 cruisers, of a total tonnage of 385,076 tons; Japan has 33 cruisers, of a total tonnage of 206,415 tons; and the United States has 18 cruisers, of a total tonnage of 146,000 tons. While I am crediting the United States with 18 cruisers, she has only 10 cruisers of the modern class, is building 2, and has authorized and appropriated for 6, but they have not been laid down nor the contract let for their construction.

So you can readily see that the great maritime nations recognize that cruisers have an important mission to perform in the defense of a nation.

Let me call your attention to the fact that during the six years since the Washington conference England has laid down and appropriated for 57 ships of war, Japan 127, France 101, Italy 71, and the United States 19. Therefore during the six years since the Washington conference England has built warships at the rate of 9 a year, Japan at the rate of 21 a year, France at the rate of 16 a year, Italy at the rate of 11 a year, and the United States at the rate of 3 a year.

Of the 57 warships built and authorized by Great Britain since the Washington conference, 17 are cruisers; and of the 127 warships constructed by Japan, 16 are cruisers; and of the 101 ships constructed by France, 7 are cruisers; and of the 71 ships built by Italy, 6 are cruisers; and of the 19 ships of war built and authorized since the Washington conference by the United States, 8 are cruisers.

Mr. Chairman, this measure provided for the construction of the ships within a definite period of time; that is, the laying down of these ships within three years, five cruisers a year, and the completing of them within six years.

Our responsibility is to provide for the national defense of the country, and I am opposed to delegating that authority to some bureau. If there is no time limit within which these ships are to be constructed, Congress and the country would have no assurance when they would be built. I am opposed to a paper navy. The naval mission of this country requires ships of steel, and for one I want Congress to say when ships for the defense of the country shall be built and not leave that important question to the Budget or any other department of the Government.

Authorizing that these ships be built within six years is in the interest of economy. They can be built within that time, and to string out the building to a longer period of time entails additional expense.

If this program is adopted and these ships are constructed within the six years, we will then have a cruiser strength in 1934 of 33 modern cruisers, of which 23 will be 10,000-ton cruisers carrying 8-inch guns and 10 of 6,600 tons each with 6-inch guns. We will then have the same number of cruisers that Japan has to-day, and 30 less than Great Britain has at this time. Then our fleet will be far better rounded out and properly proportioned than it is to-day.

The cost of this program will be \$274,000,000, which will be spread over a period of six years and as this program must be commenced during the fiscal year 1929 to be completed within the time limit prescribed in the bill, an appropriation for the commencing of the work on five cruisers must be carried in the present appropriation bill. It is estimated that \$5,000,000 will be sufficient for this year.

The present appropriation bill will carry \$72,760,000 for the existing program heretofore authorized. Therefore we are safe to assume that the total appropriation for building for the year 1929, including this program, will not exceed \$77,760,000 and in 1930 the existing program heretofore adopted will call for an expenditure of \$52,703,600 and this program will call for an expenditure of \$47,916,666 making for 1930 a total building program of \$100,620,266, and the total building program for 1931, including the present existing program and this proposed one, will be \$114,061,816, and for 1932 the existing program and the proposed one will be \$75,716,668.

In 1932 we will complete the existing program heretofore authorized. In 1933 this program will entail an expenditure of \$47,250,000; in 1934, \$26,000,000. This, therefore, is an average yearly expenditure for six years, from 1929 to 1934, of new construction of every character for the Navy of \$73,568,125.

After a most exhaustive hearing, your committee concluded to authorize but one airplane carrier. By our failure to authorize the five carriers recommended by the Navy Department, let no one conclude that the members of the committee are not fully

cognizant of the great value and absolute necessity of aviation in the Navy. It is the eyes of the fleet and in future naval engagements will play a most important part.

I yield to no one in enthusiastic support of aviation and the important function it has. The facts are these:

Under the Washington treaty we have still available 69,000 tons that can be used in constructing airplane carriers. We have now the *Saratoga*, the *Lexington*, and the *Langley*.

In view of the fact that an airplane carrier of 13,800 tons as proposed in this bill is somewhat experimental in nature, and it has not yet been proven as to whether or not a ship of that tonnage has the stability of deck required for the taking on and taking off of airplanes, to use all the tonnage until it had been definitely established would, in our opinion, be unwise.

As soon as the Navy Department concludes the exact tonnage that they desire the airplane carrier to be, then I know that I voice the sentiment of an overwhelming majority of the committee when I say that they will ask Congress to provide them.

Mr. Chairman, the nations signatory to the Washington treaty under its terms meet again in 1931. This Nation has always taken, and will continue to take, a leading part in seeking to bring about further limitation of Navy auxiliary vessels, and our committee did not desire to lay down a program beyond the date at which the Washington conference would convene in the hope that at that conference an agreement can be reached limiting the tonnage of cruisers, submarines, and destroyers. It is devoutly to be hoped that the day is not far distant when the great maritime nations of the earth will reach an agreement. To do so will be a step in the interest of the peace of the world, and America must take and will take a leading part in bringing this about.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. What was the lowest intimation that England made to America at Geneva on cruisers? Was it not over 400,000 tons?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Six hundred thousand tons; and if America had gone to England's proposal, instead of its being a limitation of armament conference it would have been a building program. Our delegates did not do so, and rightly they did not do so, and we are not asking you to build any more ships than Mr. Gibson submitted at the Geneva proposal.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Was it not said that they could have agreed if they had put 6-inch guns on cruisers?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. A great debate took place, but the result was that England said that on account of her position in the world she needed a larger cruiser fleet than we thought her position demands. Therefore we were unable to reach an agreement. If Mr. Gibson's proposal had been brought home and the sentiment of America ratified it, there is not a man here who would not have readily voted to let America's ships be brought up to her treaty strength. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

The Chair will state that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] has remaining 15 minutes in favor of the bill and 32 minutes against the bill. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] has consumed all of his time and the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McCLINTIC] has 38 minutes left.

Mr. McCLINTIC. I think it is fair to yield to the opposition some time.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I would like to yield some of my 38 minutes to myself. I yield now five minutes to the lady from California [Mrs. KAHN].

The CHAIRMAN. The lady from California is recognized for five minutes.

Mrs. KAHN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, I certainly appreciate the courtesy of the gentleman from New York [Mr. LaGUARDIA], because he knows I am going to speak in favor of the bill.

I have a habit of drifting in to all sorts of gatherings just to hear what the other fellow has to say, and just before the recent upset in China I happened upon a pacifist meeting.

As I came in the brilliant Chinese editor of a daily paper in San Francisco was speaking. He was picturing China as the realization of the pacifists' dream. In effect he said: "Here is a country absolutely nonmilitaristic, hardly a trained soldier, not a semblance of an army worthy of the name, no navy, not even a merchant marine."

A country such as you would have this country become. And with flashing eye and fiery voice he turned on them and said, "And what has this made of China? A pie counter for almost every nation on earth." [Applause.] Every predatory nation has rushed and grabbed a piece, and China has had to stand tamely by for they feared her not. She dared not pro-

test for she had nothing with which to back up her protest. Would England, France, Germany, Russia, or Japan have refrained from taking her fairest possessions because, forsooth, she said, "I am helpless; rob me not." And to-day what is the condition of China? No stabilized government, overrun with bands of bandits, fighting with each other, and preying upon the innocent multitudes.

We are not entering upon a competitive program, we have no ulterior motive, no dream of imperialism, no nightmare of world domination, no desire to camouflage a navy of offense as one of defense. Simply a Navy sufficient to keep open the lanes of commerce in case of necessity.

Aside from the international obligation to keep open the canal, so ably presented by my colleague from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS], we have a moral as well as a legal obligation toward our island possessions, their welfare, and their commerce.

We carried the spirit of altruism to the nth degree in living up to the spirit as well as the letter of the Washington conference, otherwise we would not be in the position we are in to-day, far below our agreed quota.

That is all that need to be said to the people of the country that we are below not beyond the 5-5-3 agreement; that we are not entering upon an orgy of building, so quiet the epidemic of hysteria, in spite of the objection of the Member from Minnesota, spread through the land by an unfortunate presentation of the program, on the one hand, and by deliberate misinterpretations and false statements, on the other, which are being kept alive by continued propaganda. As soon as I realized what the propagandists were doing I issued a statement to the newspapers in my district explaining the program, and the flood of protests almost ceased. Many in audiences before whom I have spoken came to me and said, "Oh, is that what it is; why, of course, that is all right. I am so glad you explained. I thought it was a competitive program with billions to be spent at once."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the lady from California has expired.

Mrs. KAHN. May I have one more minute, Mr. LaGUARDIA?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes. Mr. LaGUARDIA will yield. [Laughter.]

Mrs. KAHN. I thank you.

We who dwell on the Pacific have a keen appreciation of the Navy and know what it means and for what it stands. We know the Pacific will be the great commercial highway of the future and the part the Navy will play in the building up of its trade, and I wonder how many of you have seen as I have the fleet steaming in majesty through the Golden Gate, felt the thrill of pride as you realize here is something that will maintain the inviolacy of our flag; that will command respect abroad; that will guard our citizens and enforce our rights on the high seas and on foreign shores, the symbol of our Government—power, peace, protection. [Prolonged applause.]

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the Chair how much time I have?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 15 minutes for the bill and 26 minutes against the bill.

Mr. BUTLER. I would like very much, indeed, to yield to a member of my committee one-half of the time I have, and then I am going to beg the House give the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLACK] 10 minutes outside of the arrangement. I now yield seven and one-half minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. EVANS]. That is half of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized for seven and a half minutes.

Mr. EVANS of California. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, along with my friend the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON], who preceded me this afternoon in this debate, I want to say that I am proud of the privilege, the first time I appear on the floor of this House, to speak in defense of my country and in behalf of national defense. I believe that that is a rather wholesome and deserving cause on which to embark, and I trust that when my service here is completed, whether it be short or otherwise, I can still look on this privilege in the same light. [Applause.]

The bill before the committee at this time is one of the most important with which the present Congress will have to deal. It involves the matter of our national defense, and it will doubtless be conceded that no problem with which the country is confronted is of more vital importance. Everyone recognizes the desirability and urgency of internal improvements, such as flood control, development of our waterways and harbors, and other improvements of similar nature, but we believe that it will be conceded that no basis of comparison lies in the need for internal improvements with the imperative need of maintaining our national defense. In other words, if we need pro-

tection in any degree we need it above all other things. Our policy of adequate national defense is traditional and coextensive with our national life and the history of our country. But the proposed legislation can not be held as being in the way of or to the exclusion of adequate legislation for flood relief. This bill calls for only the sum of \$45,000,000 annually for six years, and no one will seriously claim that this amount would create a very heavy obligation for our Government to assume.

Our country has for more than 30 years advocated the principle of settling international disputes by arbitration and agreement. Every President, including and since the time of the Cleveland administration, has stood aggressively for this great reform. The people of our country have unitedly supported our leaders and statesmen in their efforts in that direction. Our Government has taken the leadership and responsibility of calling and causing to be held two international conferences for that purpose. The willingness of our Government and of the people of the United States to make any reasonable contribution to the principle of outlawing war and conflict by friendly negotiations and arbitration can not be discounted. While it is true that the results accomplished so far in this behalf are not all that were hoped for, it can nevertheless be said that they were not altogether disappointing, and it is hoped that further efforts may be crowned with a greater degree of success.

In the absence of such international agreement we have left only the one course to pursue, and that is to continue to maintain our Army and our Navy, not for the purpose of intimidation or threat to any other nation, but for the perfectly legitimate and reasonable purpose of upholding national integrity and the protection of our people, their lives and property, both at home and abroad. For this purpose our Navy is the most potent factor, and the question that irresistibly forces itself upon us is that if we are to have a navy what sort of navy shall it be? Are we to be content with a mere makeshift, or shall we insist on a navy in keeping with our place and standing among the nations and one reasonably adequate for our national defense? We believe that we are safe in acting on the assumption that the people of our country will not be satisfied with anything less than a navy worthy of the name and, as well, the purposes for which it is maintained. If we are to have a navy of this kind, it is imperative that we build new ships from time to time as the old ones go out of commission and become useless.

Mr. O'CONNELL. If we go along with the program of the committee we shall still be behind the provisions of the 5-5-3 ratio, shall we not?

Mr. EVANS of California. Yes. Regardless of what may be said to the contrary, every Member of this body knows that the question of maintaining a navy for adequate defense depends on the size of other naval powers. In other words, it is impossible to deal with this question without taking into consideration the relative strength of other navies. Ambassador Gibson, before the Geneva conference last June, said in his opening statement:

Before suggesting tonnage allocations in the various classes, I desire to state that we frankly recognize that naval requirements are relative, that building programs on the part of one power may well require expanding programs on the part of others, that if these limits are adjusted they should be adjusted for all.

At this point I wish to divert for a word. I concur with our beloved chairman, Mr. BUTLER, in every word he has said in commendation of Admiral Hilary P. Jones, who was one of our representatives at the Geneva conference. In my opinion too much praise can not be given Admiral Jones for his work and effort in advocating the truly American principles for which he stood at that meeting. I want to extend these same words of praise to our ambassador, the Hon. Hugh Gibson, the chairman of that conference. I have read his speeches and have been impressed with the true American manner in which he presented the cause of this Government and the high ideals of our people. He is a man of whom all America is justly proud. I feel it a distinct honor to be able to say that Ambassador Gibson, together with his much loved and highly respected and talented mother, are residents of the district and of the city which I have the honor to represent in part, and I deem it a privilege as well as an honor to be able to say of Ambassador Gibson and of his dear mother that no finer type of American citizens can be found in this country.

Going back to the subject of comparative armaments among the nations, it can be well said that if no other nation had a navy our country would correspondingly have no use for one.

Your committee has conducted hearings over a period of two months, meeting almost daily and remaining in session from two to three hours each meeting, at which hearings every pos-

sible effort was made to gain information with reference to the true and actual conditions of our own Navy and its needs, and further endeavored to gain information from which reliable comparisons could be made of our naval armament with that of other world powers. Before authorizing the construction of additional naval armament the members of this committee and this body are entitled to know, and should know, just what we have in the way of naval strength so as to be able to pass some judgment on whether or not it is reasonably adequate for the purposes for which it is maintained and how it compares with the same sort of defense maintained by other powers. The information set forth in the report which accompanies this bill is a concise statement of the deductions made by 20 of the 21 members of the committee. I know that every member whose name is attached to the report will concur with me in saying that due to the capable efforts of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ANDREW] the facts set forth in this report are correct and that they may be relied upon by the Members of this body.

Some of the salient features are as follows:

As to capital ships, we have under the Washington conference a parity on a 5-5-3 basis with Great Britain and Japan.

At the present time the number of modern cruisers built, building, and appropriated for in these three countries stand as follows:

The United States has 18, with a total tonnage of 146,000.

Great Britain has 63, with a total tonnage of 386,000.

Japan has 33, with a total tonnage of 296,000.

In numbers these cruisers rank in order of importance as follows:

United States	1.4
Great Britain	5.0
Japan	2.6

In tonnage they rank as follows:

United States	1.9
Great Britain	5.0
Japan	2.7

It has already been emphasized by other speakers on this bill that the United States has in the service now 22 cruisers of the average age of 24 years. These are in addition to those included in the ratios just above mentioned. The standard life of a cruiser is 20 years. Every one of these old cruisers is over 20 years of age except 5, and those 5 will be over 20 years of age in less than one year from this time. Every one of these cruisers is perfectly worthless for offensive and defensive use in case of conflict. Therefore the only cruisers we now have in the service of modern and useful type are ten 6,000-ton ships mounted with only 6-inch guns. When the eight new cruisers heretofore authorized, two of which are now under construction, are completed this will give us 146,000 tons, as set forth in the report.

If the 15 ships called for by this bill are authorized and built, we will then have a total cruiser tonnage of 296,000 and will yet be approximately 100,000 tons below Great Britain in cruiser strength. These figures should prove to be reassuring to those who warn us against any sort of a constructive program that tends toward competitive building. We would have to add to this program another 100,000 tons before we could be said to be in the competing class.

At this point I wish to refer to what seems to be an overdeveloped antipathy on the part of some of our countrymen to any move on the part of our Nation to bring our naval strength up to that of Great Britain. It is urged by this line of thought that if the lanes of the sea were closed to the British Isles suffering would result in a short time. It has been claimed that Great Britain more than the United States is in need of types of ships, such as cruisers, that are swift and of widest range of action; and to stop the lanes of trade of Great Britain suffering would be brought to the people within a few weeks, while, on the contrary, our country could be cut off from the rest of the world and there would be food for the people. The same thought was injected into this discussion by a question addressed to the gentleman from Massachusetts while he was on the floor making the opening statement on this bill. Some of us can not fully subscribe to this line of thought. Followed to its final analysis it amounts to substantially saying that our world trade is not a necessary factor in our economic life, and in case it became necessary for the purpose of avoiding conflict with other nations it would be better to yield our rightful place on the sea and among the commerce of the world than to go to the expense of maintaining a Navy on a parity with the other large navies of the world. If we concede the right of any other nation to maintain a navy far superior to our own in the light of our own needs, we acknowledge a willingness to assume a place of inferiority in naval power. If this is our attitude, we were not justified in standing out for a

parity on the 5-5-3 basis at Washington in 1921, nor were we justified in asking for the same ratio at Geneva.

Our commerce is equal to and greater than the commerce of any other nation and is deserving of as high a degree of protection as that of any other nation or country in the world. It will be remembered that we were closed to the sea in 1914. We were not then in war, nor were we in war for nearly three years thereafter. At that time we had on the seas approximately \$16,000,000,000 worth of American goods. Production was going on throughout our land. All at once our commerce ceased to move. What happened? The Southern States of our Union were the first to suffer. There was found baled and piled up in the towns of the South more than \$500,000,000 worth of cotton which the producers were anxious to turn into cash with which to pay the costs of production and other pressing obligations, but the market was closed because American commerce, that of a neutral nation, had been driven from the seas.

Suppose the seas were closed to our commerce to-morrow by reason of a conflict between two or more other nations over which we had no control or with which we had no direct concern. We would be caught with over \$20,000,000,000 worth of American goods on the seas bound for all ports of the world. Is it not inevitable that there would be suffering as a result of this condition? It is a mistaken idea to say we are sufficient unto ourselves in the matter of food supplies as well as in other commodities. In 1926 we purchased and imported into the United States \$266,000,000 more in food supplies than we exported. It has already been pointed out by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] how we are absolutely dependent on foreign markets for practically all the manganese and rubber used in this country. Admiral Hughes testified before our committee that if we were deprived of importing manganese for a short time our iron and steel industries would disappear. We could build no railroads, bridges, or other improvements employing these products. He also said that our large automobile industry in this country is wholly dependent on the foreign supply for rubber.

As proud as we are of our great resources, both developed and undeveloped, we think it is altogether proper that we occasionally take stock and ascertain whether we are, after all, a really self-contained nation. I, for one, believe that it is just as important that we keep our lanes of commerce open to all the ports of the world as it is for Great Britain or any other country to keep her trade lanes open. Freedom of the seas is a tradition with America and has been since the birth of our Nation, and, in so far as I am concerned, and in so far as my vote is concerned as a Member of this body, until some better plan can be agreed upon through the means of disarmament or otherwise, our Navy will continue her rightful place on the seas with a standard of equipment and efficiency for which this country will have to make no apology. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield seven and one-half minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WAINWRIGHT]. My friend on the other side has given him five minutes. That will close me out for the debate.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 12½ minutes.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I ask that I be not interrupted until I have concluded my remarks.

Gentlemen, I rise to support this bill. I approach the matter under consideration from the standpoint of one who believes that this country should lend itself in every way, by every means at its disposal, and exert its influence to secure a reduction of naval armaments. I believe we should do everything we can to reach an agreement with the other great powers of the world to relieve the people of our country and the people of other countries of the burden of naval armaments. But until that day arrives, and until we can reach such an agreement, I believe that we should have a Navy as large as the navy of any other country in the world.

I was glad to hear the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KVALE] say that he believed in an adequate Navy. Gentlemen, that is the whole question before us. What is an adequate Navy for the United States under the present situation and in the absence of such an international agreement?

This bill involves our highest responsibility under the Constitution, namely, the assurance of the national defense. Others may recommend, but the ultimate responsibility is ours. It has aroused much discussion and caused much agitation both at home and abroad. Well-meaning people have sought to influence our action and divert us from our responsibility, but that responsibility is such that it can not be shared with others. It is inspiring to contemplate that our Committee on Naval Affairs have so splendidly arisen to their responsibility and declined

to be diverted from their duty by pressure the other way from well-meaning but misguided sources. The action of that committee representing all sections of the country, the interior as well as the seaboard, reflecting various shades of public opinion, should foreshadow the action of this House, of which they are so worthy a part. In matters involving the national security we are not justified in relying merely on fortunate chance and providing for the national security upon the assumption that we shall never, never be called upon again to resort to force either to repel aggression or to protect our just rights or interests.

I feel quite sure, in fact it has been indicated in this debate, where the opposition to this bill has been really perfunctory, that the action of the House will ratify, and ratify in a most impressive manner, the recommendations of our Committee on Naval Affairs.

The charge at home here is that this measure is unnecessary; that it involves competitive naval building, the very thing which we should seek to avoid. It comes principally from those who would be quite content, I am sure, that we should indulge in no naval building at this time or at any time, who feel that because no war clouds darken the sky that we may well let the Navy remain as it is, and they urge us to pass no such bill as this.

And as to the criticism from abroad, may I recall to your minds the recent words of our President—

where there is no treaty limitation, the size of the Navy which America is to have will be solely for America to determine.

And the fact that there is no treaty limitation, notwithstanding our efforts to secure one, is precisely the reason why it is incumbent on us now to regulate and provide for the size of our Navy in relation to our own security and possible needs.

But they say this program of naval construction will involve us in competition in naval building with England. Not at all. As the committee so clearly shows, even with the ships here provided for, we shall still be far behind Great Britain in cruiser strength, and certainly it is furthest from our thought or intention at this time, or at any time, I hope, to engage in a course in anything that will involve us in difficulty or misunderstanding with the British Empire. God grant the day never comes again when there will be serious controversy between the United States and the mother country of so many of us of English origin. We have tried to agree with her on the number of cruisers and other craft apart from battleships that each of us shall have and failed. What then? Are we to refrain entirely from building? Are we to engage in merely sporadic or desultory building, leaving construction to the chance whim of each session of Congress? Or are we to adopt some program or standard of strength and provide for a well-rounded Navy adapted to our possible needs, with the various elements bearing some logical and definite relation to each other?

Clearly prudence and our duty as representatives of the American people require the latter. Cruisers, aircraft carriers, and submarines are as vitally necessary as battleships, yet shall we provide no adequate cruisers for our Battle Fleet, or so few as to leave the fleet impotent in that vital element? Imagine either of the grand fleets having entered the battle of Jutland, without cruisers and cruiser screens. Shall we also make no provision to replace our obsolete cruisers? No provision for the protection of our trade routes, for the full protection of the Panama Canal, or our island possessions. If we are to maintain our battleships at the 5-5-3 ratio, are we to give no concern as to the necessary auxiliaries for those battleships? These are questions that must be answered. At the time of the Washington conference we had a program adopted way back in 1916, the completion of which would have given us naval superiority or supremacy. That we cheerfully renounced and destroyed 30 battleships, 15 of which were afloat and 15 approaching completion, with a total displacement of at least 800,000 tons, on which we had spent at least \$300,000,000. Then at the conference we offered to conform our cruiser strength and the other elements to the capital-ship ratio to be agreed upon. But that was refused by the other conferees, and all were left free to develop and increase those other elements as they chose or saw fit, and the others have built far more than we have, until, as Admiral Hilary Jones puts it, "We are too far behind the procession." The 5-5-3 ratio for battleships was solemnly agreed upon; the treaty ratified by our Senate. Is it to be ignored? Will anyone say that it is not the duty of those responsible for the public welfare to provide for our adherence to that ratio in capital ships? And, if that be so, can we neglect the other necessary components?

The Secretary of the Navy, with the approval of the President, brought in a much more extensive program, looking much further into the future. It was tenable and sustainable in that it would have tended to bring us up to the 5-5-3 ratio in the

auxiliary components. But the committee brings in this much more moderate program carrying us only to 1934. To-day the ratio in cruisers of the 5-5-3 countries is Great Britain, 5; Japan, 2.6; the United States, 1.9. If this program is authorized and appropriated for, and the ships completed, we shall still be in a position of inferiority, with Great Britain with 63 cruisers with 386,636 tonnage and a ratio of 5 both in numbers and tonnage, with the United States with but 33 cruisers of 296,000 tonnage with a ratio of 2.6 in numbers and 3.8 in tonnage, with Japan with 33 cruisers of 206,415 tonnage with ratio of 2.6 in numbers and 2.7 in tonnage. And this on the assumption that the other countries indulge in no further building in the meanwhile.

Gentlemen, the question presented to us here and now is, Shall we reduce our present inferiority in naval strength or shall we permit it to increase and our ratio of naval strength to go down and down until we are less than third rate among the naval powers? For one I am not satisfied to lend myself, by failure to support this bill, to any such contingency, and I am confident that the overwhelming majority of our countrymen and countrywomen, too, are of the same mind and that the taxpayers will cheerfully contemplate the moderate burden of only about \$45,000,000 a year involved in view of the vastly important object in view.

Of course, the whole weight of this country should always be exerted to preserve harmony among the nations. Of course, no one need have any fear that we ourselves shall give just cause for offense to any other nation. We must, and we certainly shall, lend ourselves in every way to the perpetuation of peace in the world. Heaven knows we in common with others have recently had the bitter experience of war, and now know how liable we are to be drawn into the maelstrom in case of another world conflict. But in the light of history, in the light of our recent experience, would it not be folly, worse than folly, for us to regulate our affairs upon the assumption of the existence of a condition in the world which does not exist? Certainly we should strive to be leaders and moulders of that world spirit and sentiment without which there can never be any assurance of lasting peace. But, until conditions in this world change very much, no serious statesman will feel that this country can afford to neglect considerations affecting the security of his own country. And the standard of the measures for our security must be not probable conflict, but possible conflict. In conclusion, may I say, Mr. Chairman, that I for one am in favor of taking no chances, but of making the most complete provision for our national security on the seas until and unless we can arrive at some definite agreement for further reduction which at the moment unfortunately seems impracticable. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. All time in favor of the bill has now expired.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to make a unanimous-consent request. Because of my remarks on yesterday, directed toward the National Council for the Prevention of War and really against Mr. Frederick J. Libby, its president or operating chief, who is in the gallery again to-day, I have been requested to insert at this place in the RECORD the action of the Board of Education in the District of Columbia on January 21, 1925, in which, by unanimous agreement, they refused Mr. Libby permission to address the school children at any time. This request comes from the gentleman in the gallery through the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SPEAKS]. In fairness I think it ought to go in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, what has that to do with approving or disapproving the merits of this bill?

Mr. BRITTEN. Nothing, except that this organization has sent out, I suppose, tons of literature in opposition not only to this bill, but to everything else connected with national preparedness. On yesterday I called the attention of the House to this Board of Education report, and I think in fairness to the gentleman this complete report of the board of the District of Columbia ought to go in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. MCCLINTIC. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I want to say that the Boston Daughters of the American Revolution has had quite a revolt against the action of the lady who appeared here in behalf of this bill, and inasmuch as their protest has been given wide publicity, I think permission ought to be given for their statement to go in at the same time.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has a newspaper clipping in his hand. It is different from the official action of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Mr. Chairman, I object to both of them.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. SPEAKS. Will the gentleman from Oklahoma yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma has not the floor. The gentleman from New York is recognized.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 16 minutes.

Mr. SPEAKS. Will the gentleman from New York yield for a half minute?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. For a half minute; yes. I will yield to the gentleman for the purpose of making a unanimous-consent request, but it must not be taken out of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 16 minutes.

Mr. SPEAKS. Mr. Chairman, in a spirit of fairness and after investigating the situation, I ask unanimous consent that this official report—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York has the floor.

Mr. SPEAKS. I am preferring a unanimous-consent request.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. For the purpose of preferring a unanimous-consent request, but not to be taken out of my time.

Mr. SPEAKS. My request is simply that the complete report of the District of Columbia Board of Education, from which a quotation was made yesterday, be permitted to go into the RECORD.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I am going to object to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MCCLINTIC. I shall not object to the request of the gentleman from Illinois if you play fair with all parties.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I shall object to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma, because that is an aspersion upon a very patriotic organization.

Mr. SPEAKS. What I am asking is that the official report of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, over the signature of the secretary, be inserted in the RECORD.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, I demand the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. The regular order is demanded. The gentleman from New York has the floor.

Mr. SPEAKS. Mr. Chairman, was my request granted?

The CHAIRMAN. Objection has been heard.

Mr. SPEAKS. Where did it come from? I did not so understand it.

Mr. MCCLINTIC. Unless you allow all of these articles to go in, I shall have to object. If they will permit this to go in, I will have no objection to the other.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair suggests that these unanimous-consent requests should be made in the House and not in the Committee of the Whole. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 16 minutes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, yesterday the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN] made some reference to this matter, and to-day the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SPEAKS] asked to put the complete letter and report in the RECORD. I ask unanimous consent at this point, Mr. Chairman, to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD by putting in the RECORD the complete report.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner indicated.

Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I desire to read a document with respect to the Board of Education of the District of Columbia:

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON THE LIBBY CASE

BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,

Washington, D. C., January 21, 1925.

To the Members of the Board of Education, Washington, D. C.:

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: Your committee appointed in accordance with the action of the Board of Education at its meeting of December 3, 1924, with instructions to investigate the views and affiliations of Mr. Frederick J. Libby in order that the board might determine whether Mr. Libby should be permitted to speak in the schools has the honor to submit its report.

On the evening of December 18, 1924, your committee conducted a hearing at the Franklin School, at which time a large number of friends and opponents of Mr. Libby were present and asked the privilege of being heard. Some of the speakers appeared before the committee to

present their individual views. Others spoke as representatives of organizations. It was evident that there was considerable opposition from citizens and bodies of citizens to Mr. Libby's request for permission to speak in the schools. All persons who participated at the hearing were requested to submit briefs to the committee setting forth in writing their reasons for or against Mr. Libby being granted the privilege to speak in the schools. The request was freely complied with and a great quantity of printed circulars, typed memoranda, and briefs was submitted. Your committee has reviewed the evidence presented at the hearing and, after giving consideration to the statements submitted for the information of the committee, desires to present to the Board of Education the following conclusions and recommendations:

(1) The discussion of the issues underlying the questions before the committee became more or less acrimonious as the opposing views were presented by the contending parties. It became evident as the hearing progressed that extreme views were being expressed on both sides. Your committee was impressed with the fact that important national and international political issues were being debated; that far-reaching principles of political economy involving the friendly relations of world powers were under consideration; perplexing questions of such magnitude and complexity that even statesmen of international repute were in doubt as to their best solution. The committee is of the opinion that the discussion of such important political issues in assemblies of high-school pupils, made up mainly of boys and girls only 14 or 15 years of age, must undoubtedly be confusing to young minds. When they acquire more mature judgment our young people have a better basis in thinking for themselves and thus to arrive at opinions on vital public questions. Political science, however, is a subject for the university more than for the high school. The average boy or girl of high-school age has difficulty in exercising sound judgment on the merits of a discussion that presents an extreme view on the national defense act, the inefficacy of national preparedness, or a partisan view of the League of Nations.

(2) Not only should it be deemed unwise to permit the expounding of big national political issues from a partisan point of view in our high-school assemblies, but it would be contrary to the rules and practice of the public schools of the District of Columbia to allow such discussion from a religious point of view. This is in conflict with certain principles underlying the operation of our American public schools. Although the rules of the Board of Education require the reading of the Bible in the opening exercises daily, teachers and others are not permitted to comment on or to discuss the Scriptures and their meanings. In the hearing Mr. Libby stated that his views in regard to war and national preparedness are based upon his religious convictions.

3. The American people as a Nation expect that patriotism and love of country shall be taught in the public schools of the land. Much of the inspiration giving rise to feelings of patriotism in our boys and girls grow out of the achievements of our American ancestors. Our history is rich in the noble deeds of illustrious Americans, deeds that stand for achievements by explorers, inventors, pioneers, statesmen, soldiers, captains of industry, poets, scholars, and men of science. Our school histories recite the deeds of these renowned Americans so that we are not surprised that in the hearts of our boys and girls they stand out as national heroes and rightly so. Every American boy and girl should be permitted to cherish the memory of these heroes. Whatever may be the horrors of war, and however we may be opinionated in regard to war or the means for its prevention, we can not permit the heroic sacrifice of the men who gave their lives for their country to be minimized. In practically every household the memory of one or more loved ones who paid the supreme price is held sacred. Your committee is convinced that the patriotic sentiments of the average American boy or girl should not be confused by any teaching that the ancestors may not have been prompted by the highest motives in the prosecution of war or that the war in which they fought was a great national blunder. We are convinced that the American people by and large have "highly resolved that these dead shall not have died in vain."

For the several reasons set forth in this report your committee recommends that the discussion of far-reaching, controversial political issues in our high-school assemblies should not be permitted by any person or persons whose presentation of such questions is from the point of view of an extreme partisan. Nor should persons be permitted to speak in our schools to whom there is opposition to an unusual degree by large numbers of citizens and organizations of citizens. Your committee holds that Mr. Frederick J. Libby entertains extreme views on the public questions that he has discussed in regard to war and preparedness, and therefore, recommends that his request to speak in the schools be denied.

E. C. GRAHAM,

Chairman,

ERNEST GREENWOOD,

LILLIAN Y. HERRON,

F. I. A. BENNETT,

Committee, Board of Education.

A true copy.

HARRY O. HINE,

Secretary Board of Education, District of Columbia.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] without doubt has made the best argument in favor of the bill. The gentleman made a most forceful argument for his side of the question.

Yesterday I endeavored to make what I will call a spiritual appeal, an appeal based upon what I considered would be the best policy for this Government to follow. All the Navy experts, I am sure, will agree that not only the present naval power of a nation must be taken into consideration, but its potential power, and as to potential power, resources, finances, geographical situation, and home industries we are so far ahead that I repeat I see no danger of this country's safety being impaired in the next generation.

I will not attempt to continue on the spiritual side of the opposition. Let me to-day set forth the material side of this question. I want to make clear for the Record that the country should understand that besides the additional cruisers and the plane carrier in the present bill calling for an appropriation of \$274,000,000, we have now authorized and appropriated for a program for which we carry in the naval appropriation bill for the next fiscal year, which will be before us in a few days, over \$72,000,000, and which carried to its conclusion will cost the people of this country \$201,561,450, in accordance with the figures presented by the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH] to the House this morning.

And let me say, in referring to the figures of the gentleman from Idaho, there is not a better-informed man on the Navy in this House or in this country than the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH]. [Applause.]

Mr. SHALLENBERGER and Mr. VINSON of Georgia rose. Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Will the gentleman permit me to add another figure which I have just taken from the figures the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH] gave us? In addition to the figure of \$201,000,000 which the gentleman speaks of, there is the maintenance program of \$2,255,000,000.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. That is in a certain period of time.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Yes.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. There is a slight discrepancy of \$40,000,000 between the figures I cited and the figures of the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I will help the gentleman to correct his figures if he will permit.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The existing program now in the 1929 appropriation bill will call for an expenditure of \$72,760,000. Assuming this bill becomes a law and assuming the ships must be built within the time prescribed, it is necessary for the program this year to carry at least \$5,000,000 to authorize the commencement of five ships. This will mean, therefore, this year an expenditure for new building, including what is already upon the books, of \$77,760,000.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Five million dollars more. That is the way it goes—continually piling up.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. In 1930 this program and the one already adopted will cost \$100,620,000. In 1931 this program and the one already upon the books will cost \$141,000,000. In 1932 it begins to decrease because the program upon the books has been finished, and the cost will be \$75,000,000, and in 1933 the cost will be \$47,000,000, and in 1934 it will cost \$26,000,000. By 1934 we will have finished the 15 ships, the airplane carrier, and everything that we have on the books to-day, including the five-year aviation program and including the two dirigibles, which will be at the rate of \$73,000,000 a year for the next six years.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Exactly. I make it \$475,561,450, and the gentleman is slightly below that, but what is a difference of a million or two million dollars in the consideration of a program of this kind?

Besides this I want to emphasize the point made by the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH] that to operate each one of these additional cruisers will cost us about \$1,247,500 a year, and to operate an airplane carrier will cost us \$1,400,000 a year. So as soon as the ships are completed the operating and maintenance cost of the Navy will increase permanently several million dollars a year.

And let me add right here that the figures stated by the gentleman from Georgia do not include the building of the 12 destroyer leaders authorized by the act of 1916. That will be over a hundred million dollars.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Of course not, because the Navy Department has not asked for them to be built.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. But they will before we are out of here very long, and also for the three additional submarines.

Now, as to the relative strength of our Navy. May I point out that comparisons of all classes of ships have not been made? I want to show here, for instance, that on submarines

of the first line we have 50, with a tonnage of 43,822 tons, to England's 29, with a tonnage of 24,150, and Japan's 45, with a tonnage of 36,497.

As to submarines of the second line, for coast defense, we have 65, with a tonnage of 31,282; England has 23, with a tonnage of 9,928; and Japan has 10, with a tonnage of 3,259.

Surely these figures, which are official and which I obtained from the Navy Department, indicate that our Navy is well ahead in these classes of ships.

It has been said by the experts that the destroyers are what we need to protect the merchant marine, which, by the way, we have not got. When we come to the destroyers, we have 262, with a tonnage of 312,479. England has 164, with a tonnage of 187,150. Japan has 83, with a tonnage of 193,470.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNELL. What is the gentleman quoting from?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. From the Navy Department. We also have 25 destroyers of the second line, assigned to the Coast Guard.

I want to emphasize these figures for the purpose of showing that we are not as weak as some gentlemen desire in emphasizing their arguments as to the needs of the Navy.

Mr. CONNERY. Will the gentleman yield? I have been trying to get time, and I wish the gentleman would allow me to make a short statement.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I yield.

Mr. CONNERY. I have been listening all afternoon to gentlemen of Congress defending the right of the United States even to create any Navy at all. I do not see them standing up here as a patriotic proposition and saying that we should have a navy as large as England. They say we should not have the temerity to create cruisers and battleships and aircraft carriers, because England might not like it.

I do not like that kind of talk coming from Members of Congress of the United States, especially on the eve of St. Patrick's Day. [Laughter and applause.] St. Patrick's Day brings back memories of fighting Jack Barry, the father of the American Navy, with Irish blood in his veins, who never kowtowed to England and never asked England's permission about building ships, but went out and fought the British Navy to save this country. This same Jack Barry, who, when Lord Howe offered him \$300,000 in gold and the command of the best frigate in the English Navy, replied, "Not for the value of the English Navy and the command of it all could I be seduced from the cause of my country."

I am sick and tired of these pacifists throughout the United States who are saying that this bill is aimed primarily at the mother country. The only mother country I recognize is the United States of America. [Applause.]

Gentlemen of the House, I stood in France in the front-line trenches, and I saw my buddies die because the United States was not prepared in 1917 and 1918; they did not have an opportunity to teach these boys how to handle the rifle. I saw them die, and realizing our unpreparedness I do not want to see the same thing happen because the Navy is unprepared. I would like to speak at length on this bill, but have not had the opportunity, so I would like my colleagues to know that I will vote for this bill, but would much rather vote for the program set out by President Coolidge, which would give us an adequate Navy, which this bill does not give us. I thank the gentleman from New York for his courtesy. He has always been my friend; I have always admired his courage and ability, and I thank him again. [Applause.]

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, that is a very powerful interruption to make in a speech when I am opposing the bill. [Laughter.] But I love my friend CONNERY and am always glad to hear him. But let me say to my colleague that I, too, saw these boys die; but I also saw the boys of Germany, who had the most perfect training and were part of the greatest military machine, beaten by those boys who, he says, had no training at all. [Laughter and applause.] You can not get away from that.

No; I do not agree with the gentleman from Massachusetts. I still believe, gentlemen—of course, the bill will pass—I still believe we have a great opportunity at this time. As well off as we are domestically and financially and in every other way, we have the opportunity to show the world that we have learned a great lesson from the World War. We can inspire the people of all nations and make the hope for peace something real.

It is going to be extremely difficult for other nations to understand why at this time we are adopting this naval program. I will concede that it is not a competitive program, but I say it is "keeping up with the Jones's" policy.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I yield.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Is not this the largest program we have ever offered in a time of peace?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. With what we have already authorized and appropriated for, it is one of the largest naval bills; yes.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. And larger than that of any other nation?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes; I do not see the necessity of it at this time.

Now, you gentlemen of the Mississippi Valley, we have a greater war on our hands—the war against the elements. We have to regulate the whole Mississippi Valley. That is a war for humanity. I will vote for three or four hundred million dollars for a humane purpose of that kind. [Applause.]

Now, let me say to you from the farming districts that when the farmer asks for relief you will have to tell him that you can not give it because we are building a navy to protect the ships which we have not got—that carry the wheat we do not export. [Laughter and applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLACK].

Mr. BLACK of New York. Mr. Chairman, I announced at the outset of this debate that I intended to support the President's program, and it is a pity that I have to obtain time from the gentleman who is opposing the naval program generally. Many times I have been humiliated in the course of this debate. I hardly wanted to speak at all at this time, when this American Congress is about to haul down the American flag on the high seas for the cheapest kind of politics I have seen since I have been in Congress. The logic has been a little diverting at times. The whole debate on both sides should be summed up in a jingle:

There ain't going to be no war,
There ain't going to be no war,
But how in hell can the people tell
There ain't going to be no war?

The Republican convention at Cleveland promised this country a Navy living up to the 5-5-3 ratio. They promised this country a regular party government and they promised this country a cooperation between the President and the Congress. They promised this country that they would live up to their constitutional obligations, and the Constitution calls upon us to provide for the national defense. The country is committed to a 5-5-3 ratio and the Republican Party is committed to it, and yet this committee has come in with a bill, and they confess that it does not live up to the 5-5-3 ratio. They come in with a bill that is a compromise between those who want no Navy and those who want to go to the country and say, "We are trying to do something about the American Navy." I have been disgusted during this debate to hear men get on this floor and quote from British experts, British admirals, and British statesmen. I was going to use some quotations from Commodore Barry, but I would be ashamed to quote from Barry on the day before St. Patrick's Day when we are doing this disgraceful thing to the American Navy that is proposed in this bill. Every man on this committee knows that this thing that they are presenting here does not provide us with an adequate Navy. And the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH] in an honest fashion exposed them this morning. They said that the reason they did not go down the line with the President is because there is already existing authority in law for destroyer leaders and for submarines. I asked the gentleman from Idaho on the floor this morning if the Appropriations Committee intended to appropriate this year for submarines and destroyer leaders, and his honest answer was "no." So from the beginning that statement, in which they predicated their desertion of the President on existing authority, has been without foundation in fact, and it is the cheapest kind of political bunk.

We are doing more to-day than providing for a Navy. Great Britain knows what we are doing to-day. Great Britain knows that this policy of a naval parity means the end of Great Britain as the economic leader of the world. Great Britain is not being fooled about this situation. I shall quote some British experts too, if it will be of any consolation to the committee. First, I quote from Hector Bywater, who says that this is a fine bill and that the President's bill was all wrong. Then, Admiral Bridgeman said yesterday in Parliament that this naval bill is not offensive to Great Britain. Of course it is not! The only naval bill that could possibly hurt her feelings is the bill that would give us parity on the high seas. In view of our economic leadership we are entitled to supremacy on the high seas, and when we create a parity with Great Britain we make concessions to her, and however you look at it, you gentlemen on the Republican side of the House are false to your

Constitution, are false to your President, and are false to your Republican Party platform.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired except that in the control of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McClintic], who is recognized for 38 minutes.

Mr. McClintic. Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the House, I may not use all of the time that remains. I am very much pleased that it is my privilege to close the debate of what has been a most interesting discussion. I regret exceedingly, as I said before, to differ in opinion with many Members of the House and of the committee. However, I think every person who has followed my course will admit that my difference of opinion has been an honest one. Since I have been a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs I have conscientiously tried to do that which, I think, is best for our Nation, and in presenting my side of this question I hope to give you some figures to show that the statements that I make are warranted. I look at every public question in this manner. If I am right in my viewpoint, eventually I shall win, and if I am wrong, then, I deserve to lose. I took that position about 10 years ago on the subject of aircraft. At that time I was practically alone on the committee, and notwithstanding the fact that at different times it was somewhat humiliating to be defeated by votes of those with whom I was associated, yet I persevered and continued my activity as best I knew how, and I am glad to say that 90 per cent of the American people to-day realize that aircraft is the most important factor when it comes to dealing with the subject of national defense. So I say that while the membership of my committee does not agree with me with respect to the necessity for submarines, yet if the other nations of the world continue to build this kind of ship in large numbers, and there should come to us an unfortunate conflict, this country would be in an embarrassing situation because we would be unprepared to that extent, and our commerce will have to pay the penalty.

I am presenting a plan as a substitute for that of the majority of the committee which would cause 15 of the larger types of submarines having the latest safety devices to be built in place of the cruisers. Feeling and believing that the record of the last war and the record that relates to the destruction of merchant tonnage fully support my position, I make the statement that the most disastrous type of ship ever invented in peace or in war time is the submarine.

There are those here who would like to see some submarines added to this bill, and they will vote for the amendment that I intend to offer. I would be much pleased, notwithstanding the fact that I wish it were possible for the nations of the world to abandon this type of destructive ship, to see this country be able to cope with any kind of a situation that might arise.

Now, much has been said concerning the subject of cruisers. Some of the members of the committee have made statements in their speeches which I consider rather unfortunate, for the reason that if these statements are printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and the same should be sent to some of the foreign nations they are bound to come to this conclusion, that America, the United States, is trying to build up a Navy having in mind making preparation for war against some particular country.

Now, I would rather take the position that the five major nations of the world are sick of war. I would rather take the position that the amount of their public indebtedness at this time is so enormous as to practically stagger the imagination of the ordinary mind. What is the public debt of the five major nations at the present time?

A little more than \$75,000,000,000; \$75,000,000,000! And what is the population of the world at the present time? A little more than 1,800,000,000. In other words, the five major nations of the world owe more than \$40 for every man, woman, and child all over the world. And why has this great debt been created? To pay the enormous losses occasioned by war.

So there is a justification for those of us who would like to economize and expend our money for the development of those enterprises which are closer to our homes. We want to expend our money for the improvement of economic, agricultural, and other conditions that need so much improvement at the present time, particularly agricultural and flood relief. So I have joined with those who have spoken on this floor in saying that we should first take care of the conditions that vitally affect our own people.

Everyone who has ever testified before the great Military Committees of Congress has said—and I think it can be said without fear of contradiction—that as long as we maintain in this coun-

try an adequate aircraft defense or force no nation on earth can encroach upon our shores.

So if that is true, why is it not safe to first take care of those things that are urgent, such as the great Mississippi flood, the Mississippi disaster, and other economic and industrial conditions that exist in the land?

Mr. O'CONNELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McClintic. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNELL. I am one of those in the House who have to differ from the gentleman from Oklahoma in regard to this matter. But does not the gentleman think the United States ought to be on a parity with the other nations with which we have this agreement?

Mr. McClintic. I thank the gentleman for the interruption. That brings me to a statement that I desire to make at this point; a statement which will probably be interesting, or should be interesting, to the Members of the House. Nearly all of the comparisons that have been made with respect to this legislation referred to England and the number of cruisers that England has in comparison with those of the United States. Now, I want to tell you something, and I hope you will take out your pencils and figure a little with me, and if I make a wrong statement you will correct me. England has 49 cruisers, with a tonnage of 246,776. Of this number, 42 have a tonnage of less than 5,200, with a maximum speed of 29 knots; a total tonnage of 186,410, leaving a balance of only 7 cruisers, with an aggregate tonnage of 60,366 tons.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McClintic. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Where is the gentleman getting those figures?

Mr. McClintic. From the Navy League, the organization that always asks for an adequate Navy. Referring to the seven cruisers, there is the *Vindictive*, with a tonnage of 9,996; the *Hawkins*, with a tonnage of 9,820; the *Profisher*, with a tonnage of 9,860; the *Eppingham*, with a tonnage of 9,770; the *Emerald* and the *Enterprise*, each with a tonnage of 7,100; and the *Adventurer*, with a tonnage of 6,740; making a total of seven cruisers, and all of them but two having a speed of less than 33 knots per hour.

On the other hand, the United States has 10 of the Omaha type, cruisers of 6,600 tons, with a speed of 34 knots, as against an average of 29 knots to those belonging to England, and twelve 6-inch guns in comparison with seven 6-inch guns on the English cruisers. You are bound to admit this fact, that if the United States has cruisers which have on them twice as many guns of the same caliber that they exceed in efficiency the ships which belong to England, and if the United States has 10 cruisers that have a speed of 34 knots as against 7 cruisers that have a speed of less than 29 knots, and with double the efficiency when you consider the number of guns, then we must admit that we excel England on that basis.

It is true England has laid down 14 cruisers, but I have here a statement, which I will read into the RECORD, from an English official who ranks sufficiently high that no one can impugn his motives or deny the authenticity of his statement, and he is Mr. Churchill. He says:

The decision of the Government to postpone the laying down of the three cruisers included in the program for this year is an earnest, and a most striking one, that they regard the work of the Geneva conference as by no means abandoned. We congratulate and thank them. Nothing is more valuable just now than a plain sign flashed through a night of misunderstanding that Great Britain wants peace and means to have it. The larger cruiser is one of the two that are dropped. The Government have given just such a proof as we desired to the United States that we do not intend to invite her to a competition in cruisers.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Will the gentleman yield for a suggestion?

Mr. McClintic. Yes.

Mr. WOODRUFF. I suggest to the gentleman that he disclose to the House the type of cruisers that England has laid down since 1924.

Mr. McClintic. I am glad the gentleman asked that question. I want to say that according to that statement England has abandoned the program of building any more until the United States acts. The United States is now confronted with this situation: We have a bill here which authorizes the construction of 15 cruisers, which means this is a competitive proposition. You can not call it anything else, and if we continue the construction of 15 cruisers, of course England will have to go ahead and lay down and complete the 14 that she has on her program.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. McClintic. I prefer not to yield.

Mr. WOODRUFF. I asked the gentleman to inform the committee as to the type of cruisers already laid down by Great Britain since 1924. The gentleman did not answer that or give the committee the information.

Mr. McCLINTIC. I have just made the statement that England has practically abandoned that particular program.

Mr. WOODRUFF. I am speaking of ships already laid down since 1924.

Mr. McCLINTIC. And that is what I have been talking about.

Mr. WOODRUFF. They have not been abandoned.

Mr. McCLINTIC. I say they have, or Mr. Churchill has deliberately falsified.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Wait a minute.

Mr. McCLINTIC. I do not care to yield further.

Mr. WOODRUFF. I do not blame the gentleman. If I were in the gentleman's place, I would not yield either.

Mr. McCLINTIC. I have quoted from the records of the Navy League.

Mr. WOODRUFF. And I am speaking from the same record, which I hold in my hand.

Mr. McCLINTIC. You had an opportunity to talk about this, and I hope I may proceed without being interrupted.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield further.

Mr. McCLINTIC. I want to state to this House that when you talk about a parity on cruisers you ought to give all the facts and not one or two facts. Every single, solitary destroyer we have in our Navy to-day has an excess of speed over 42 of the 49 cruisers belonging to England. In other words, all of our destroyers can exceed them in speed, and can move away from them or move up on them, so long as they have these little tiny ships called cruisers—I have classed them as cruisers because they are in what I term the destroyer class. So much for the cruisers.

Mr. BRITTEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCLINTIC. Yes.

Mr. BRITTEN. My impression is that there is some confusion about the remarks you read as made by Lord Churchill.

Mr. McCLINTIC. I will put them in the Record, and that will be sufficient.

Mr. BRITTEN. I know, but all the ships the gentleman has referred to as not being laid down and as having been abandoned are now under construction. They are not being abandoned, and I want the gentleman to be set right.

Mr. McCLINTIC. For the benefit of the House and the gallery, I will say I will put the statement in the Record. I will put in the names of these little, tiny ships that this Nation uses in comparison, calling them cruisers, because they average less than 5,000 tons. When you make a comparison with the seven cruisers that England has remaining, which are a part of these cruisers built, every one of them is far less superior when a comparison is made of their strength from the standpoint of guns and speed.

England's 42 cruisers (destroyer type) of less than an average of 5,000 tons

Date built	Name	Com- mission expires	Tonnage	Speed	Guns
1911 ¹	Weymouth	1931	4,860	25	8 6-inch.
1911 ¹	Dartmouth	1931	4,860	25	Do.
1912 ¹	Yarmouth	1932	4,860	25	Do.
1913 ¹	Melbourne (A)	1933	5,120	25	Do.
1913 ¹	Sydney (A)	1933	5,120	25	Do.
1914 ¹	Birmingham	1934	5,120	25	9 6-inch.
1914 ¹	Lowestoft	1934	5,120	25	Do.
1915 ¹	Calliope	1935	3,920	29	4 6-inch.
1915 ¹	Castor	1935	3,920	29	Do.
1915 ¹	Champion	1935	3,920	29	Do.
1915 ¹	Carysfort	1935	3,895	29	Do.
1915 ¹	Cleopatra	1935	3,895	29	Do.
1915 ¹	Comus	1935	3,895	29	Do.
1915 ¹	Conquest	1935	3,895	29	3 6-inch.
1916 ¹	Brisbane (A)	1936	5,120	25	8 6-inch.
1916 ¹	Cambrian	1936	3,920	29	4 6-inch.
1916 ¹	Canterbury	1936	3,920	29	Do.
1916 ¹	Constance	1936	3,920	29	Do.
1916 ¹	Centour	1936	4,120	29	Do.
1916 ¹	Concord	1936	4,120	29	5 6-inch.
1917	Caledon	1937	4,180	29	Do.
1917	Calypso	1937	4,180	29	Do.
1917	Caradoc	1937	4,180	29	Do.
1917	Cardiff	1937	4,290	29	Do.
1917	Ceres	1937	4,290	29	Do.
1917	Curlew	1937	4,290	29	Do.
1918	Coventry	1938	4,290	29	Do.
1918	Curacao	1938	4,290	29	Do.
1918	Carlisle	1938	4,200	29	Do.
1918	Dauntless	1938	4,850	29	6 6-inch.
1918	Danae	1938	4,850	29	Do.
1918	Dragon	1938	4,850	29	Do.
1919	Cairo	1939	4,200	29	5 6-inch.
1919	Calcutta	1939	4,200	29	Do.
1919	Colombo	1939	4,200	29	Do.

¹ Will become obsolete before 1937.

England's 42 cruisers (destroyer type) of less than an average of 5,000 tons—Continued

Date built	Name	Com- mission expires	Tonnage	Speed	Guns
1919	Dunedin (New Zealand)	1939	4,850	29	6 6-inch.
1919	Delhi	1939	4,850	29	Do.
1921	Durban	1941	4,850	29	Do.
1922	Capetown	1942	4,200	29	5 6-inch.
1922	Despatch	1942	4,850	29	6 6-inch.
1922	Diomedes (New Zealand)	1942	4,850	29	Do.
1922	Adelaide	1942	5,100	25	9 6-inch.

Mr. BRITTEN. Will the gentleman please yield there?

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Chairman, I would rather not yield any further.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. BRITTEN. I am trying to help the gentleman and not trying at all to confuse him.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Chairman, I have been interested in what is termed the majority report. The majority report bears the name of one of the highest class members of our committee, Mr. ANDREW, of Boston, Mass. Mr. ANDREW has let it be known to this House on different occasions that he wanted the indebtedness of France reduced, and there are many of the citizens of the Nation who feel that he would like to remit all of the debt that France owes this country. I was interested in the statement made a few minutes ago by the gentleman from Georgia, in which he called attention to the number of ships that have been built by France, by Italy, and by the other nations with whom we had proposed settlement. In other words, it showed that notwithstanding the fact that we had settled with Italy, that Italy was using what might be termed this reduction or this saving on her war debt, for the purpose of building competitive armament.

Italy's debt, including interest, was reduced approximately two-thirds, and it is proposed to reduce the debt of France one-half. Thus it can be seen no real good can be accomplished by cancelling the debts of any nation, when it will allow the money saved to be used in war preparations.

I take the position France ought to pay her debts like any other nation, and I can not understand why the Member who wrote the report for this committee should want to saddle on the people of the United States an enormous building program and then turn right around and give France a debt that amounts to over \$4,000,000,000. It seems to me this is inconsistent. I take the position that every nation in the world ought to pay its debts, and I do not think any situation could ever arise where this country would be warranted in remitting the honest obligations due it. So I am going to suggest to my friend from Massachusetts if he will read the history that relates to France and her treatment of the United States when Talleyrand acted in the position which corresponds with our Secretary of State, when Chief Justice John Marshall was over there trying to get that nation to deal fairly with the United States, and then go on and read about the administration of "Old Hickory" Andrew Jackson in dealing with France, he will get some information that will show that this country has dealt fairly with France or has dealt more fairly with that country than she has dealt with us. So I was somewhat amazed to find this gentleman the author of the report on the bill in view of this situation.

Now, Mr. Chairman, going back to the legislation, this morning in the papers there is a statement by the Associated Press which reads as follows:

LONDON, March 15.—The correspondent is able to state definitely that the British Cabinet has secretly considered Secretary of State Frank B. Kellogg's proposal for outlawing war and decided it must accept. The Government now is busy seeking a formula which will permit frank, unreserved acceptance without infringing on existing liabilities such as the League of Nations. The Dominions, especially Canada, are also being consulted.

In addition to this, the morning papers carry another statement which is headed:

Arbitration treaty offered to Japan.

I am only calling the attention of the committee to this kind of statement published to-day to show that there is no war cloud on the horizon; that there is not a single reason that could be based upon fear for this Nation to engage in a building policy that will immediately excite the animosity of some of the major nations.

I take the position that the United States ought to be prepared to face any kind of situation. I say to you that I would be the last one to ever oppose a program that was needed to defend our country; but when one takes into consideration the

results of the World War and compares them with the conditions that exist to-day, he is bound to admit that it was the newer and modern appliances that finally brought victory to the Allies.

What about the Battle of Jutland? Did England win it? No. Germany would have been given credit for winning the Battle of Jutland had it not been for other situations and conditions existing at that time.

In the Battle of Jutland, if I understand it correctly, there were no airplanes that carried big bombs. Such bombs had not been invented up to that period of time. Since that date a new era has developed in this respect, and to-day we are able to load in aircraft enormous bombs and fly out a distance of 200 miles and with one bomb sink or destroy the usefulness of any kind of craft afloat.

We have 18 battleships from which could be launched aircraft suitable to carry these bombs, and these 18 battleships represent an investment of \$720,000,000. In view of this situation how can anyone say it is wrong for us to spend about \$1,000,000 in order to make it possible to carry this larger type of bombing plane, thereby enabling our battleships to be their own aircraft carriers, and have a fighting range of approximately 200 miles?

This is the kind of preparedness we want this Nation to have. This is the kind of amendment I shall offer to this bill. I want this Nation to have the best offense and defense possible, but I do not want to build a lot of cruisers just for the purpose of allowing a large number of officers, who are now stationed in this city or in other ports, to have a nice, comfortable berth in peace times.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. MCCLINTIC. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I have been seeking during this debate to get information such as the gentleman is now giving us, and I gather from what the gentleman has stated that it is his judgment the United States is superior to Great Britain in submarines. Does the gentleman also state we are the equal of Great Britain in cruiser strength in battle if we were to go to war with that country to-morrow; and I would like to also ask the gentleman how we stand on battleships with respect to that country?

Mr. MCCLINTIC. I am very glad the governor has asked that question.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I would like to summarize the statement about the strength of the two navies. All we hear here reads very much as though we are going to fight Great Britain, and if we are going to fight Great Britain I want to know how we will stand. I have not heard anything but that during this debate, and I want to know how we stand with regard to Great Britain.

Mr. MCCLINTIC. I regret the fact that the debate as it will be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will leave the impression with the British people that the United States is secretly preparing for war. This is not the fact, and I have read at least a half dozen statements from the highest authorities in Great Britain showing they have a most friendly disposition toward this country.

Now, as to submarines, the United States have a great many submarines of the smaller type that are out of commission. Here I have only made a comparison of the newest type, the V type. I have put in the RECORD the information that France had authorized the construction of 27 of the newest type and has 20 now being built. Italy has authorized 20 of the newest type and has 12 under way. Japan has authorized 24 of the newest type and has 14 under way. England has authorized 24 and has 6 under way. The United States has authorized 6 and has only 3 building.

These are the latest figures given to me in respect to submarines. In addition, I have a statement from the Wall Street Journal that calls attention to the Electric Boat Co. making the statement that it has a contract involving the sum of \$50,000,000 for submarines for one of the major nations. In other words, the major nations of the world, or some of them, are asking the shipbuilding concerns of the United States to build for them submarines.

I was informed to-day that this contract for \$50,000,000 of submarines was ready for signature and that work is to begin within the near future. I do not want to put a statement into the RECORD as to what country this refers to, but if any gentleman wants to know I will show him this record.

I want to say further that it seems to me that if representatives of this Nation on this floor were confronted with the fact that the four major nations of the world exceed us by a ratio of more than 5 to 1 in the type of ship that sunk 11,000,000 tons of ships during the World War, the type of ship that the highest authority admits is the most disastrous to commerce,

surely we would resolve ourselves into a mental condition whereby we would listen to arguments along this line.

I say to you that if war should come upon us to-morrow we would be in a very embarrassing condition if 20 or 30 of these newest types of raiders should go out on the sea and attack our commerce.

I say that if your house is on fire and burning down and you are not willing to put water on it, something is radically wrong with the individual who takes this position. Submarines ought to be banned, and every other death-dealing instrument ought to be banned, poisoned gas ought to be banned, and every other death-dealing instrument ought to be banned. But when other nations use them we have to use them to protect ourselves. That is the situation with respect to the submarines.

Now, Mr. Chairman, when this bill was under consideration by the Naval Affairs Committee many distinguished citizens came before the committee and offered their testimony. One of these distinguished citizens was the chairman of the American Legion, Mr. Stafford. I do not know why he came before the committee; I suppose he was invited to come. The American Legion is one of the highest-grade organizations we have. I would be the last person on earth to say a word against the American Legion; but when an officer, be it the president or anybody else, comes before our committee and makes certain statements which are not carried out, I then wonder what is wrong.

When Mr. Stafford came before the committee with a great deal of pomp and ceremony he announced that as an individual he stood for this policy. His language was:

I have followed the discussion here, and I am of the opinion that we better strengthen the hands of the committee in every way possible. Therefore I shall send out to the different branches of the American Legion a statement of the facts and they will send back letters or telegrams to Members of Congress, who will have to answer therefor.

I made a careful canvass and can not find a single American Legion organization that sent an indorsement in reply to Mr. Stafford. So I came to the conclusion that he was giving us a lot of hot air or he has been repudiated by his own organization. If the organization was for this bill and he called upon them to indorse it, certainly somebody would have received an indorsement before this time.

Mr. CONNERY. Let me say that from the Legion post in Lynn, Mass., I have received a resolution saying that they favor President Coolidge's proposition.

Mr. HALE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCCLINTIC. Yes.

Mr. HALE. Will the gentleman read from the RECORD the resolution passed by the Legion at the national convention at Paris indorsing the naval construction program which would keep the United States in the ratio adopted by the Washington conference?

Mr. MCCLINTIC. When that convention was held this child had not been born. The authenticity of its parentage is denied. The President has said that it is not his bill, and the Secretary has said that it is the President's bill. The American Legion does not claim to be its parent, and so I have about concluded that the statement made by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Vinson] is correct, that it is the child of the Committee on Naval Affairs. And I say further that every single Member who has spoken for the bill has either a lake or an ocean in his back yard. [Laughter.]

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Except me.

Mr. MCCLINTIC. Oh, the gentleman has one that is about 400 miles long. So it only goes to show you that these Members here wanted to defeat flood control and agricultural legislation, and I make the prediction now that if this bill becomes a law and the sum of \$274,000,000 is appropriated, we will not get a dime for the Mississippi River Valley flood control or for agricultural relief.

Mr. UPDIKE. Surely the gentleman would not say that I have a lake or an ocean in my back yard?

Mr. MCCLINTIC. Indiana borders on the Great Lakes.

Mr. UPDIKE. Borders on the Great Lakes, but they are not in my district.

Mr. MCCLINTIC. I know that, and I still stand on the statement that I made.

Mr. EDWARDS. Does the gentleman wish to leave the inference that he is against this proposition because he has neither a lake nor an ocean in his back yard?

Mr. MCCLINTIC. No; I do not leave any inferences at all. I make the statement that this bill has not any place here at all until we take care of the Mississippi River flood situation and agricultural legislation. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired. All time has expired, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President of the United States is hereby authorized to undertake prior to July 1, 1931, the construction of 15 light cruisers and 1 aircraft carrier according to the following program:

(a) Five light cruisers during each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1929, 1930, and 1931, to cost, including armor and armament, not to exceed \$17,000,000 each.

(b) One aircraft carrier prior to June 30, 1930, to cost, including armor and armament, not to exceed \$19,000,000: *Provided*, That if the construction of any vessel herein authorized to be undertaken in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1929, or 1930, is not undertaken in that fiscal year, such construction may be undertaken in the next succeeding fiscal year.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McCLINTIC: Strike out, on page 1, after line 4, balance of the paragraph and insert in lieu thereof the following: "15 modern submarines of a tonnage not less than 2,000 displacement when submerged, and the construction of an extra deck or platform suitable for the launching of aircraft on each of 18 battleships, according to the following program:

"(a) Five submarines during each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1929, 1930, and 1931, to cost not to exceed \$5,000,000 each;

"(b) One aircraft launching platform on one battleship during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1929;

"(c) One aircraft launching platform on two battleships during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1930;

"(d) One aircraft launching platform on three battleships during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931; and

"(e) One aircraft launching platform on each of four battleships during each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1932, 1933, and 1934, respectively, the cost not to exceed \$1,000,000 each: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Navy in letting contracts for such construction shall give a reasonable preference to bids made by the Government navy yards: *And provided further*, That no funds shall be expended for any other kind of reconditioning for such ships until plans and specifications shall have been approved covering the proposed aircraft additions."

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is distinctly out of order. It provides for a character of ship which has never yet been built. It provides for modernizing battleships, when there is no indication in the bill under consideration by the House that modernization or repairs are intended. The bill provides for a number of new ships, and I contend that the amendment is out of order. I make the point of order that it is not germane to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Oklahoma desire to be heard?

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Chairman, all I have to say is that this is a bill to increase the efficiency of the Navy. As I view it, it would not make any difference whether it is a destroyer, a cruiser, or an aircraft carrier, or whatnot. A battleship, as I look upon it, at the present time is an obsolete instrument of war. Battleships in the last war were not utilized. I do not think a Member can show that a single shot was fired by an American battleship in the last war. I do not believe that anybody can say that there were a dozen shots fired by American cruisers. If we are considering a bill to increase the efficiency of the American Navy, it ought to be germane to offer any kind of addition that will make a ship more efficient.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the Chair to understand that these aircraft launching platforms are to be put on existing battleships?

Mr. McCLINTIC. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. This bill distinctly provides for the construction of new naval vessels. Nowhere in the bill is there provision for the improvement or alteration of existing battleships.

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard on the point of order. [Cries of "Rule!"]

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, if there is any question in the Chair's mind about this amendment being in order, I should like to be heard upon it for a moment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Without reference to the merits of the amendment, it seems to me it would be a dangerous precedent to hold that the proposal offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma is not in order. This is a matter of construction of the Navy. It was held long years ago in a decision which used to be cited every time we had the naval appropriation bill under consideration, before the adoption of the Budget system, that an amendment to an appropriation bill providing for an entirely new vessel was in order, because the Navy was

a continuing work. To say that in a bill providing for the establishment or the continuation of navy structure one must be limited to the program laid down by the Committee on Naval Affairs—and that would be what a decision sustaining this point of order would amount to—would be to deprive the House of an opportunity to pass upon the kind of vessels that it thought ought to be constructed in connection with the Navy, and, in my opinion, would be a most dangerous precedent.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. And did not the vote on an appeal from the decision of the Chair the other day emphasize the necessity for a greater latitude on the question of germaneness? I refer to the ruling of the Chair when the radio bill was under consideration, and the decision of the committee on appeal from the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Yes; I think so, but even that is not necessary to be cited for maintaining my position upon the matter immediately before us. I do not think there can be any question about this matter of germaneness in this instance. I believe the Chair on the day referred to by the gentleman from New York quoted from a decision which I had the honor to make once when I was in the chair, when I said that the fundamental purpose of an amendment must be germane to the fundamental purpose of the bill. If that is admitted as good law—and I think it is, and I thought it was at the time—undoubtedly the fundamental purpose of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McCLINTIC] is germane to the fundamental purpose of this bill, which is to increase the efficiency of the Navy.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois if he will not withdraw his point of order so that the House can have an opportunity to vote upon this amendment? I think we could have passed upon it by this time if the point of order had not been made.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I will withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois withdraws the point of order. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McCLINTIC] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Chairman, I want to say just a word. This is your Navy just as much as it is mine. As I view it, the efficiency of the Navy can be increased five times by an expenditure of not to exceed \$100,000,000. If we adopt this amendment we will have just that much more to take care of our internal conditions, and at the same time we will make our Navy very much more efficient than it is at present.

I have discussed this subject with officers of the Navy. I am convinced that it can be done. I know that there is not a single ship in the Navy to-day that carries a bombing plane other than an aircraft carrier, and by the adoption of this amendment it will not bring about a situation which is prohibited by any treaty that we have made with other nations of the world, for the reason that if you can carry observation and spotting planes on battleships now, we would also have the right to carry bombing planes. So let us strengthen our Navy so that each one of these battleships can maintain a fighting radius covering a distance of 200 miles, instead of depending on guns that shoot approximately 24 miles. [Applause.]

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, for nine long hours have we discussed this matter, and I hope the House will vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McCLINTIC].

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. McCLINTIC. A division, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. A division is demanded.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 22, noes 129.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McCLINTIC: In line 5, page 1, strike out the words "15 light cruisers" and insert in lieu thereof "15 modern submarines of a tonnage of not less than 2,000 tons displacement when submerged"; and in line 7 strike out the words "light cruisers" and insert in lieu thereof "modern submarines with a tonnage of not less than 2,000 tons displacement when submerged"; and in line 9 strike out the figures "\$17,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "\$5,000,000."

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and ask unanimous consent to speak out of order for 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent to speak out of order for 15 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I trust the committee will permit the gentleman to speak for 15 minutes. In that case I think, after he has used his 15 minutes, we shall be able to have a vote on the bill this afternoon.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Chairman and ladies and gentlemen of the House, I endeavored to obtain some time to speak in favor of this bill under general debate but I could not do so. I thank the membership of the House for giving me this opportunity to speak.

At the time of our entrance into the World War and during the war the slogan was that it was a war to do away with wars, inhuman methods of warfare, and large Military and Naval Establishments. However, we find that the nations of the world are now expending more than double the amount for Military and Naval Establishments which they expended before the war. Our country has taken the lead in endeavoring to reach agreements with other nations for the reduction of Military and Naval Establishments and has not been very successful. The recent conference at Geneva clearly showed that some other method must be used than that of reducing our armament and endeavoring to have other nations do likewise. I have always been in favor of curtailing expenditures for our Military and Naval Establishments, preventing their rapid increase, and saving the taxpayers from excessive burdens. But since the recent conference at Geneva was not fruitful of results, and since the attitude taken by the other nations indicates that they desire to increase and not reduce, I now believe it is absolutely necessary, in order to bring the other nations to their senses, to create an American Army, Navy, and air force inferior to none. It is not outside the bounds of possibility for this Nation to build the greatest war machine in the world. If this Nation were earnestly to begin such a building program, the other nations would soon realize they could not compete and would be forced to agree to a reduction program.

Some of our debtor nations have been welching on payment of their war loans, holding that they are not financially able to make payments. And yet these very nations have found sufficient finances to greatly increase their military and air forces. The French debt settlement was ratified by Congress, but rejected by the French Parliament. The loans of the French debt were financed by Liberty bonds, sold to the people of America, on which our Government paid 4½ per cent interest. Under the agreement of the Debt Funding Commission, which was ratified by Congress, the United States would receive in principal and interest \$6,847,674,104.17. The total amount we would receive in principal and interest on a 4½ per cent basis would be \$11,474,900,000. Therefore, the agreement ratified by Congress, and refused by France, would relieve the French taxpayer and burden the American taxpayers to the amount of \$4,627,225,895.83. Unrefuted testimony before the House of Representatives showed France as industrially more prosperous than before the war. It showed that she is rich in valuable territory acquired as a result of the war; that she has seen fit to maintain and augment a large war machine which has been used to carry on oppressive, unjustifiable wars against the Riffs and Syrians; and that at the time of the agreement France had a military force of over 686,000 men. Further, France had sufficient funds to make extraordinary provisions for her navy and air forces, and when the committees of Congress asked the House to increase America's appropriations for the air forces, it was stated that this increase was necessary in order to bring our air force equal to the strength of the French.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. SCHAFER. Not now.

I shall vote for this bill.

There are some in the great State of Wisconsin who could consistently vote against this legislation. They could with equal consistency vote for a bill to abolish the entire air force, Navy, and Army of America.

I hold in my hand La Follette's Magazine of August, 1926. On the first page of this magazine it is stated:

Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free.

This magazine is edited by ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, Jr. In 1926 I took a stand for adequate appropriations for our Army and Navy and on certain other fundamental questions. This La Follette Magazine of August, 1926, contains an editorial

written by ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, Jr., the editor, in which he states:

In common with all sincere progressives, I greatly regret that in this critical campaign Representative JOHN C. SCHAFER, of the fourth district, has of late denounced some of the major planks of the progressive platform and has repudiated sound progressive principles long advocated as an essential part of the Wisconsin progressive program under the leadership of Robert M. La Follette.

I denounced the following plank then, and I do now, and I challenge any Member of this House to stand up and say they believe in it. [Applause.]

Listen to this. I now read a plank from the platform in question as it appears in La Follette's Magazine:

Congress has a constitutional right to an authoritative voice in foreign affairs. We favor its exercising that right to—

Promote firm treaty agreements with all countries to outlaw war, abolish conscription, and provide for a referendum on questions of peace and war.

Is there any Member of this House who favors legislation which provides that before a shot or shell could be fired to repel an invader we must put the ponderous referendum machinery into operation and have a vote of the people on the question of peace and war? If there is I ask him to stand up. [Applause.] I see no one rises.

Mr. BOYLAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHAFER. Yes.

Mr. BOYLAN. I want to ask the gentleman whether he has been read out of the party?

Mr. SCHAFER. I am talking about our national defense. This is the principle that the late Senator La Follette set up, and I quote from page 114 of the La Follette-Wheeler textbook used in the 1924 presidential campaign, wherein plank No. 11 states:

We favor such amendments to the Federal Constitution as may be necessary to provide for the direct nomination and election of the President, to extend the initiative and referendum to the Federal Government, and to insure a popular referendum for or against war except in cases of actual invasion.

To-day we find in the State of Wisconsin presidential delegate candidates running on a platform supported by Editor ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, Jr., containing the very principle of the 1926 platform which, if carried into effect, would not permit our Army, our Navy, or our air force to fire a shot or shell to repel a foreign invader until we had submitted the matter to a referendum of the people. I say again that anyone who believes in this principle supported by Editor ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, Jr., as contained in the 1926 platform and in his present delegate candidate platform, can consistently vote against the pending bill and with equal consistency can vote to abolish every piece of our Army, Navy, and air force. [Applause.]

The people of Wisconsin do not want written into the law of America legislation which will permit an invading foreign government to lay waste the great State of Wisconsin and destroy the lives and homes of our people and overcome the Nation while waiting on the ponderous referendum machinery. Foreign policy and navies are closely associated, so I would like to call attention to another plank of Editor ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, Jr.'s platform of 1926, which appears in his magazine. Listen to this:

FOREIGN POLICY

We are unalterably opposed to the entrance of the United States into the League of Nations and we denounce the administration and the Members of the Senate who voted to put this country into the League of Nations' World Court as a betrayal of a sacred public trust. We favor a resolution by Congress withdrawing America's adherence to the World Court.

I denounced that plank at that time. I voted against the World Court resolution in the House, as the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will indicate. And I now pause and ask if any Member of Congress from any part of the country, particularly Wisconsin, favors that plank. I see no one rises.

Four Members of Congress from Wisconsin voted for the World Court resolution in the House. Seventy-six Senators voted for our entrance into the World Court, including the man who ran for the Vice Presidency on the ticket with the late Senator Robert M. La Follette in 1924, and the man whom Editor ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, Jr., is now supporting as a presidential candidate. Did Editor ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, Jr., think for one moment that I would join him in denouncing those mentioned above as betrayers of a sacred public trust?

When I would not stand for a referendum before a war of invasion could be repelled, and when I would not stand for a

condemnation of the late Senator La Follette's running mate in the last presidential election and four Members of Congress from Wisconsin because they supported the World Court as betrayers of a sacred public trust, Editor ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR., sent out letters into my district saying what a great repudiator I was and asking for my defeat, and pledging that if I was not defeated in that election of 1926 he would see that I was defeated the next time.

I was opposed to our entrance into the World War, and if I had been in Congress at that time I would have voted against entering that war; but after war was declared it was our war, and I did my little bit. [Applause.] I do not tremble and crawl on my knees when Editor ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR., falsely, maliciously, willfully, and ridiculously attacks me as one who is repudiating progressive principles. [Applause.] If I run for reelection to Congress, I will be glad to meet the gentleman in any part of my district; and if I run for any office in the gift of a greater part of the voters of Wisconsin, I will be glad to meet him face to face and discuss the issues.

I think this bill is a good bill, and I shall support it. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Chairman, having listened to the testimonial of the prodigal son, I ask that my amendment may be read again for information.

The amendment was again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McCLINTIC].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Chairman, I have another amendment.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer a privileged motion. I move to strike out the enacting clause of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas moves to strike out the enacting clause of the bill and is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I know at this late hour, and in the present temper of this House and of the Members, it would be impossible to pass this motion, but we are entitled to have a vote on it. We are entitled to know how many men there are in the Congress, and especially in the House, which ought to be more representative of the wishes of the people than the other end of the Capitol, who stand for this big Navy plan.

Two hundred and seventy-four million dollars are involved in this bill besides the one hundred and sixty-four millions we have already authorized, and it does constitute a "big Navy program." I am not a pacifist and I never have been one in my life, but I am not in favor of letting these admirals put everything over on us they want to put over, just like the big generals in the Army put things over on us.

I have been getting this propaganda that you have been getting from the Navy League, which is made up of admirals and other naval officers. I have been getting their propaganda the same as you have, and I have been watching their Army and Navy Register and their other Army and Navy publications that are published for their Army and Navy Club here in Washington, and I know that any man who does not go with them is denounced by them every week, but I am willing to take their denunciation.

I want to see just how many men there are on this floor who are willing to stand up here and say they are against spending this \$274,000,000. I am one of them, and I am going to vote against the bill and in favor of striking out its enacting clause. I do not care if I am the only one here who does so vote. It is time for the people to find out who is responsible for all of the "big Army" and "big Navy" plans.

I have voted against the encroachment of the Army and the Navy upon the rights of the people ever since I have been here, and I am not a pacifist. I voted for the war. I voted for the draft act. I voted for every bill that gave the President, as the Commander in Chief of the Army and the Navy, the resources and power to win the last war. But we have had enough of war.

Mr. CONNERY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. CONNERY. The gentleman says he has been getting propaganda from the admirals. I will say to the gentleman from Texas I have not had a single letter from anybody in my district or in the country asking for a large Navy, but I have had hundreds of letters from ministers of churches asking me not to vote for the naval bill.

Mr. BLANTON. Did not the gentleman get a communication from the Navy League yesterday?

Mr. CONNERY. No; I did not.

Mr. BLANTON. My friend the gentleman from New York got it.

Mr. BLACK of New York. Yes. I was very glad to get it. It was very informing. [Laughter.]

Mr. BLANTON. I know the gentleman was very glad to get it. The gentleman is one of those who does not agree with me on this question.

Mr. WOODRUFF. The gentleman is proud of the fact that he voted for the war and voted for war measures during the war?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes. They were absolutely necessary then.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Is it not the gentleman's opinion that if he had voted the other way with others we might have saved hundreds of millions of dollars and thousands of human lives?

Mr. BLANTON. No; for we might have been in wars 20 years earlier. When you are highly prepared for war, you will have to fight sooner or later; when you have plenty of admirals and a bunch of generals prepared to fight and trained to fight and who want to fight and who know how to help get us into war, when it might be avoided. When one of them commits an act of war in a foreign country and our flag is insulted, then we are all forced into war. We demonstrated in the last war that we can prepare adequately in a short time, and the whole world then found it out.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas to strike out the enacting clause.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BLANTON) there were 14 ayes and 105 noes.

So the motion to strike out the enacting clause was rejected.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, strike out lines 7, 8, and 9 and insert: "(a) two light cruisers during each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1929, 1930, 1931, 1932, and 1933, each when completed to be designated as a leader for units composed of 25 destroyers and to cost, including armor and armament, not to exceed \$17,000,000 each."

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Chairman, I have offered this amendment not for the purpose of retarding the bill, but to take care of the needs in the Navy, as has been recommended by the Secretary of the Navy, who claimed that the President approved a bill that had in it a recommendation for destroyer leaders.

When this came before the committee I said this Nation could use destroyer leaders, but they would have to be sufficiently large to be able to carry aboard an observation and scout plane. In other words, if destroyers are to be maintained as separate units, that unit must have eyes.

A destroyer leader as stressed in the legislation would not have been an efficient ship because it is too small to be utilized for carrying any kind of aircraft. Therefore if this kind of ship was proved during the World War to be the most efficient of any in the fleet, then destroyers should be placed in the unit with a leader; a ship sufficiently large so that they can take the lead in action where destroyers alone are used.

Therefore in the interest of efficiency I want to say that destroyers should be given the kind of a leader which will make it possible for a nation to send out 25 under the leadership of a destroyer leader, and this should be a cruiser, so that such a fleet can operate independently. Such a leader must carry aircraft so that it can send planes out a hundred miles if necessary and report back what is necessary to take care of the situation. Therefore the 10 cruisers, if authorized, should be assigned as destroyer leaders, each one taking care of 25 destroyers in their separate units.

Mr. BUTLER. I do not wish to detain the committee, but is not there authority in the act of 1916 to build these?

Mr. McCLINTIC. No, sir; this provides for the allocation of cruisers after they are constructed.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McCLINTIC: Page 1, strike out lines 7, 8, and 9 and insert "three light cruisers during each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1929, 1930, 1931, 1932, and 1933, to cost, including armor and armaments, not to exceed \$17,000,000 each."

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Chairman, I have offered this amendment so that the period for the laying down of the cruisers can be extended five years, having in mind that we have representatives at the present time at Geneva for the purpose of seeing whether or not they can arrange another disarmament confer-

ence. Also it will be remembered that in 1931, three years hence, we are to have the disarmament conference here in Washington. This is mandatory. Therefore if we lay down in three years the 15 cruisers as proposed in this bill, and it could be shown by the other nations, as I state it can be shown, that they do not have an excessive tonnage of cruisers, then the United States will not be confronted with the situation again whereby we will have to scrap a lot of ships, thereby penalizing the taxpayers of the country several hundred million dollars, as they were penalized in 1922.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DALLINGER: Page 2, line 5, after the word "year," add the following: "And provided further, That the first and each successive alternate cruiser upon which work is undertaken, together with the main engine, armor, and armament for such eight cruisers, the construction and manufacture of which is authorized by this act, shall be constructed or manufactured in the Government navy yards, naval gun factories, naval ordnance plants, or arsenals of the United States."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it is not germane to the bill. The bill is to construct cruisers. The Government has the right to construct them anywhere its officials may desire. It has the right on behalf of the people and the taxpayers to use judgment and discretion to save money. This amendment would limit the discretion of the officials of this Government and confine them to certain places only, with certain equipment only, and would mean an added expense of from \$5,000,000 to \$15,000,000. It is not germane to the purpose of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The Chair thinks that this amendment is clearly germane. The bill provides for the authorization of certain cruisers and vessels for the Navy, and the Chair thinks it is germane that certain details of their construction shall be provided. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Chairman, during the greater part of our history the construction and equipment of naval vessels was considered to be exclusively a Government function, and navy yards were established at convenient points along the Atlantic and Pacific coasts on which many millions of dollars of the people's money have been expended.

Of late years, however, the policy of the Navy Department has been to have most of the new vessels built in private shipyards, while the navy yards have been used to only a small fraction of their capacity.

Believing that in the interest of economy existing Government facilities should be utilized and that the manufacture of armaments on a large scale by private corporations organized for profit has been in the past one of the chief incentives to war among nations, Congress incorporated in the act approved December 18, 1924, authorizing the construction of 8 cruisers, 6 river gunboats, and the modernization of 6 capital ships, the following language:

Vessels to be constructed or reconditioned by this act shall be constructed or reconditioned in the Government navy yards of the United States, when time and facilities permit, and when in the judgment of the Secretary of the Navy such construction or reconditioning would not involve an appreciable increase in the cost to the Government.

Congress has also, for a number of years, incorporated a similar provision in the annual Army and Navy appropriation bills.

Due to the manner in which this elastic language has been interpreted, however, these enactments of Congress have not had the effect which we believe Congress intended, and therefore I have offered this amendment.

For instance, when the construction of the cruisers *Pensacola* and *Salt Lake City*, authorized by the act, December 18, 1924, was contemplated in March, 1925, the New York Navy Yard's estimate, including the main engines, was \$7,799,449, and the bid of the Cramp Ship Building Co. for one cruiser, including the main engines, was \$8,673,833. The New York Navy Yard was awarded only the construction of one vessel, while the Cramp Ship Building Co. was awarded the other vessel and both sets of engines for the two cruisers. The New York Navy Yard has one of the best engine-building plants in the country, and in order to keep its industrial organization intact one of these sets of engines should logically have been awarded to the New York Navy Yard. This act on the part of the department placed the New York Navy Yard at a disadvantage in securing

work of this character on a competitive basis with private shipyards.

On April 5, 1927, bids were opened by the Navy Department for the construction of the remaining six cruisers authorized by the act of December 18, 1924. The Mare Island Navy Yard's carefully revised estimate for two cruisers, including main engines, was \$7,539,815 each. The Puget Sound Navy Yard's estimate for two cruisers, including the main engines, was \$8,045,000 each. The other navy yards did not estimate on these vessels, but the presumption is that such navy yards as the New York, Boston, Philadelphia, and Norfolk, which are equipped to do this work, could perform it at about the same cost as Mare Island and Puget Sound. This assumption is reasonable because the estimate of the New York Navy Yard on the *Pensacola* was about the same in March, 1925, as was the western coast yards estimate two years later.

Notwithstanding the low and carefully prepared estimates of the Mare Island and Puget Sound Navy Yards, they secured only one vessel each, while the remaining four cruisers were awarded to eastern private shipyards. The contract prices were as follows: The American Brown-Boveri Corporation was awarded one vessel at \$10,815,000, the Bethlehem Ship Building Corporation was awarded one vessel at \$10,675,000, and the Newport News Ship Building Co. was awarded two vessels at \$10,567,000 each. The estimates submitted by the Mare Island and Puget Sound Navy Yards and the bids submitted by the three private shipyards above mentioned are for exactly the same type of vessel according to the Bureau of Construction and Repair of the Navy Department and therefore all the figures are directly comparable.

The average of the estimates submitted by the Mare Island and Puget Sound Navy Yards was \$7,792,407.50. The average bid of the three eastern private shipyards above mentioned was \$10,656,000. This is a difference favoring the navy yards of \$2,863,592.50 per vessel, and shows that our Government could have saved \$10,656,000 if all of these vessels had been built in the navy yards. It is therefore difficult to determine how that section of the act of December 18, 1924, was interpreted which provides, in effect, that this work must be done in the Government navy yards when it would not involve an appreciable increase in the cost to the Government. Certainly when these navy yards have been operating at less than 50 per cent capacity no legitimate claim could be made that time and facilities would not permit of the work being performed in the navy yards. The Mare Island and Puget Sound Navy Yards claimed that they were equipped to construct two vessels. The New York Navy Yard had a building slip that was not being used alongside the one upon which the *Pensacola* is being constructed, and a machine shop well equipped for building the engines, due to the fact that they did not secure the engines of the *Pensacola*. The Boston Navy Yard had a building slip which by an expenditure of \$90,000 for modifications, could accommodate one of these vessels.

Furthermore the navy yards' estimate was based upon each yard carrying along its work independently. Savings could be effected by coordinating the facilities and work of the several yards, and therefore any increase in the cost above that estimated would be improbable. On the contrary, coordinated efforts would doubtless have resulted in materially reducing the estimated cost.

Hundreds of millions of dollars of the people's money are invested in our Government navy yards and arsenals. They are operated at present only from about 10 per cent to 50 per cent of their capacity. If more work is provided for these establishments the overhead will be reduced and greater and greater economies effected as the work proceeds. Navy yards and arsenals have the best facilities for doing this work existing in the United States, because that is the purpose for which they were established. They have a trained civilian personnel and a trained and experienced set of officers and supervisors. They have made good on this kind of work in the past; and we feel confident that they will make good in the future if given the opportunity by Congress.

My amendment, if adopted, will provide ample competition among the several navy yards and arsenals for this work to insure economy of construction and manufacture; and I am confident that millions of dollars will be saved the American people as a result.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DALLINGER. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman tell the House how much an estimate from a navy yard means? It does not mean anything.

Mr. DALLINGER. It does mean everything. I was informed by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON] that he

was going to speak against this amendment because he had some figures from the navy yard. I tell the Members of this House that I know how the commandants of these navy yards and arsenals feel. They are not allowed to come to Washington and tell the truth. They are instructed to add to these estimates a whole lot of overhead expenses which the taxpayers of the country are paying anyway in the Regular Army and Navy appropriation bills. It stands to reason that where a private corporation organized for profit bids on a ship of this kind, it has to get interest on the immense amount of money invested in their plant, in their building, in their machinery, and in their overhead. In the case of the Government navy yard that is all borne in the regular appropriation bills, and if the true facts should be obtained from the Navy Department, it would show that every one of these cruisers can be built in these navy yards and arsenals where the people of this country have hundreds of millions of dollars invested in these plants, for \$3,000,000 less per vessel. But the facts are suppressed, because it is in the interest apparently of certain people to give these contracts to private corporations so that they can make big profits from them. I trust the amendment will prevail.

Memorandum regarding proposed Dallinger amendment to naval construction bill (H. R. 11526)

First. The amendment reads as follows:

Provided further, That the first and each succeeding alternate cruiser upon which work is undertaken, together with the main engines, armor, and armament for such eight cruisers, the construction and manufacture of which is authorized by this act, shall be constructed or manufactured in the Government navy yards, naval gun factories, naval ordnance plants, or arsenals of the United States.

Second. If the four cruisers awarded in 1927 to the American Brown-Boveri Corporation, the Bethlehem Ship Building Corporation, and the Newport News Ship Building Co. had been awarded to navy yards the amount saved the United States Government would have been \$11,454,370, according to estimates prepared by the Mare Island and Puget Sound Navy Yards.

Third. The reliability of the present system of preparing navy-yard estimates is indicated by the fact that in the reconditioning of the battleships *Florida*, *Arkansas*, *Texas*, *Utah*, *Wyoming*, and *New York*, which according to the authorizing act of December 18, 1924, was to cost not exceeding \$18,360,000, the Boston, Philadelphia, and Norfolk Navy Yards, which did this work, did not exceed their estimates in a single instance.

Fourth. The navy yards and arsenals are adequately equipped for constructing the eight cruisers, their main engines, armor, and armament within the time limit provided in H. R. 11526, now under consideration, as will readily be seen by the partial outline of facilities available in the following:

(a) The Mare Island and Puget Sound Navy Yards each submitted estimates in 1927 upon two cruisers, including the main engines. Each of these yards secured only one vessel, therefore they are each equipped for taking on one additional cruiser.

The Puget Sound yard, according to the Bureau of Yards and Docks, has a shipbuilding dock capable of accommodating two cruisers.

The fact that the Puget Sound yard submitted estimates on four sets of engines in 1927 indicates they have ample machine-shop facilities for building four sets of engines.

The Mare Island yard is likewise qualified.

(b) The Boston Navy Yard has at present a vacant building slip which can accommodate one cruiser, by an expenditure of about \$90,000 for repairs and modification.

When navy yards submit estimates, a portion of the estimate contemplates certain necessary work on the building slips to place them in condition.

(c) The New York Navy Yard has two splendid building slips alongside of each other with traveling cranes between them. Only one is occupied in the building of the cruiser *Pensacola* at present. Another cruiser could be built on the building slip alongside of it.

The New York yard possesses one of the best engine-building plants in the country. They did not obtain the engines for the cruiser now being built; and that yard, therefore, possesses ample machine-shop facilities for building two sets of engines.

(d) The Philadelphia Navy Yard has at present two vacant building slips capable of accommodating cruisers. The cost necessary to repair these building slips will be a small item compared to the difference between the last navy-yard estimates and the private shipbuilders' bids, which amounted to nearly \$3,000,000 per vessel. The Philadelphia Navy Yard also has ample machine-shop facilities for building the engines for two cruisers.

(e) The Norfolk Navy Yard has one building slip, upon which it is necessary to expend about \$125,000 for repairs. This would be a small item to expend in order to save from two and one-half to three million dollars on the cost of a vessel. The Norfolk yard also has ample machine-shop facilities for building the engines.

(f) The Naval Gun Factory at Washington, D. C., has ample facilities for manufacturing the ordnance for these vessels. That establishment is not operating more than 50 per cent of capacity at present.

(g) The Watertown Arsenal is equipped for turning out large quantities of heavy ordnance and is operating only at a small fraction of its capacity.

(h) The Watervliet Arsenal has in the past served as an auxiliary to the Washington Navy Yard for the production of heavy ordnance. That establishment is operating only at a fraction of its capacity.

(i) The Rock Island Arsenal is well equipped for producing the smaller types of ordnance and a large variety of equipment. It is operating at present with a force of less than 500 employees, whereas during the war 15,000 were employed.

(j) The naval ordnance plant at Charlestown, W. Va., is the best equipped plant in the country for manufacturing armor and forgings for heavy guns. It is being maintained at present in condition for operation on short notice. Practically no work is performed there at present, but the plant is kept in readiness so that when work develops it can be handled efficiently on short notice.

Fifth. As industrial managers know, when a small quantity of work is performed in a large plant the overhead becomes excessive. If the Government's industrial plants above enumerated were operated at greater capacity, millions of dollars additional could be saved in the construction and manufacture of these vessels and their equipment, due to the fact that the recent estimates were based upon a relatively small amount of work compared to their respective capacities.

Sixth. All of these plants above enumerated are located in large industrial centers, and therefore have excellent labor markets.

Seventh. All of these governmental facilities, costing hundreds of millions of dollars of the people's money, provide the best equipment in the United States for doing this work and they should be used. There is no more reason for closing down these plants in order to favor private shipyards than there is for closing down all of our post offices and having the Post Office Department move into private buildings in the interest of realty companies.

Eighth. The Dallinger amendment provides that eight of the cruisers shall be assigned to the navy yards without competition with private shipyards. This is justified by the fact that even though the navy yards' estimates are materially less, contracts may nevertheless be awarded to private shipyards, as heretofore.

The navy yards and arsenals compete among themselves for work, each one desiring as large a proportion of it as possible. This furnishes far more competition than exists among the private shipyards, inasmuch as the number of navy yards and arsenals exceed the number of well-equipped and well-financed private shipyards. This competitive feature among the navy yards and arsenals for the work will insure to the Government not only economy in production and manufacture but will improve the quality of the product as well. Furthermore, no navy yard or arsenal will have any incentive for running up the costs by reason of any desire to enhance profits. Any one of them would attempt to produce the work as economically as possible even without competition. Competition among the navy yards, however, doubtless would stimulate the ingenuity of the respective managements in turning out the work economically, on time, and in producing first-class workmanship.

Ninth. Considering the availability of all this Government equipment, the highly skilled and trained naval and Army officers, the highly skilled corps of civilian mechanics, and with ample appropriations available, there appears no good reason why these agencies of our Government should not be amply qualified to perform this work at a tremendous saving to the taxpayers.

Tenth. The Cramp Shipbuilding Co. during a long term of years turned out over 100 naval vessels. Notwithstanding the fact that in 1926 they secured the building of a cruiser and two sets of engines, they went out of business by selling their shipbuilding property to the Reading Railroad Co. This action was taken in the face of a prospective large naval building program, in which they doubtless would have participated as builders if they had stayed in the business. The closing up of the

Cramp Shipbuilding Co. is regarded by the Navy Department as a serious loss to that department.

If, instead of having all of these vessels built in a private shipyard, some of them had been built in the navy yards, the experience thus acquired would still have been the property of the Navy Department, and there would be no danger to the department of losing these Navy facilities due to the vicissitudes or financial considerations of an individual private business. It is better for the United States Government to retain control of its industrial naval and military experience and facilities than it is to rely upon the contingency of private individuals remaining in business.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I want merely to say that every ship you build in a navy yard will cost a million dollars more than if you built it outside.

Mr. BUTLER. Here are the figures: One ship built in a navy yard cost \$7,000,000 more than when built in a private yard. Place the discretion where it has been, so that we can get these ships for a decent sum of money. I am not for this bill if the money is to be wasted in construction.

Mr. DALLINGER. Is it not a fact that Japan and the other countries use their navy yards to the limit of their capacity?

Mr. BUTLER. Well, I know the gentleman has a navy yard in his district, and I have one in mine. But that should make no difference.

Mr. BLACK of New York. Mr. Chairman, I want to challenge the statement made by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], and the statement of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs [Mr. BUTLER], as to the excessive cost of building ships at Government navy yards over the cost of building them at private yards. The history of the matter is entirely different. In the building of the last cruisers the eastern navy yards were not allowed to bid.

Again, on the hearings of this bill the private contractors came before the committee and stated they required \$17,000,000 for the building of each cruiser, and the western navy yards estimated the cost at about \$10,000,000 last year, a difference of \$7,000,000 in favor of the navy yards. The Navy Department did not allow the New York Navy Yard to bid on the last cruisers. They are supposed to maintain the yards to build these ships in the cause of national defense. If they do not want to build all the ships in Government navy yards, they should at least have used the Government navy yards as a check on private contractors.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Does not the evidence show that, after all, the underlying purpose is to give business to the private shipyards?

Mr. BLACK of New York. It does not show any such thing. It shows that there is a school in the department in favor of private yards. I am in favor of utilizing the public yards. The *America* was reconditioned at the New York Navy Yard. In that transaction the navy yard exceeded its figures. Why? Because when they tore up the deck they found additional things that had to be done. Of course the navy yard had to expend a little more money on it in view of the new developments. New items were added by the Shipping Board.

Gentlemen should remember that the Government navy yards are part of our system of national defense, and you gentlemen are to-day doing nothing to help in that direction. You are hurting the national defense when you adopt the policy of stifling the navy yards. I say maintain the navy yards and thus strengthen the national defense. You are not doing very much, anyhow, for the Navy. [Applause.]

Mr. LETTS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. LETTS. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I realize the sentiment here is to vote this thing down hurriedly. I am conscious, too, that a great deal of truth exists in the suggestion that was made a moment ago by the gentleman from New York [Mr. LaGUARDIA]. There is an uneasy feeling in the country, a belief, that this program has been evolved to give work to the private shipyards of this country.

Now, for my part, I am in favor of reasonable preparedness. I favor some kind of declared policy in a building program which will enable us to protect our interests here and abroad, to police our shores, and to discharge our full duty to our South and Central American neighbors and to fulfill all obligations incident to our insular possessions. I am sorry we have not considered the needs of a merchant marine first and the needs

of our Navy second. Our Navy should be adequate for peacetime purposes, but not a threat to any nation.

We ought to do what is here contemplated in a fair spirit. It is just as important an element of preparedness that our navy yards and arsenals should be efficient as it is that we should have vessels and that we should have guns and ammunition. Our arsenals throughout the country are lying idle. Our navy yards are abandoned in great part.

It is important and necessary to keep a personnel of skilled men in these arsenals and navy yards in order that we may quickly expand in time of necessity, sending out to the private manufacturing concerns of this country men who are capable of assuming leadership, to become foremen and directors of important industrial movements, men who are acquainted with the purposes of the departments and who can go ahead with the work. May I also say we ought to be fair to those who are employed in our navy yards and in our arsenals and should give them a reasonable amount of work. It does not show good business or good judgment to allow our arsenals and navy yards to remain idle and to destroy the organizations that exist there. The overhead costs go on whether our Government plants are in use or rust in idleness.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. LETTS. Yes; I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Have not the navy yards the equipment and the men to do the work just as well as the private yards?

Mr. LETTS. Exactly so. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] a moment ago made the suggestion that the navy yards could not produce any of these ships within a million dollars of the cost of producing them in private yards.

Mr. MADDEN. I said they would not. They might be able to do so, but they would not.

Mr. LETTS. I know that out at the Rock Island Arsenal, which adjoins my district, estimates have been made and contracts have gone to private manufacturers on bids which exceeded the estimates of the Rock Island Arsenal. This has been done on the ground or claim that all the Government arsenal can do is to make an estimate, and that while the estimate may be satisfactory, it is deemed to be better to pay a larger figure which is a binding bid than to accept the estimate of the arsenal, which is regarded as uncertain.

It would be better, I think, to permit our arsenals and navy yards to make binding bids on work offered by departments of the Government other than the War and Navy Departments. In this way they would be able in reality to compete with private manufacturing plants and private shipyards, all to the great advantage of the Government and the people, who foot the bills. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. DALLINGER] is just and equitable and should pass.

An investigation was made at the Rock Island Arsenal last fall at my request which revealed that over a considerable period of time the arsenal had, in the aggregate of its contract costs, been under the aggregate of the estimates and that only in one or two cases in all of those years did the cost actually exceed the estimate.

It seems a necessary conclusion that this policy, by which departments of Government refuse the estimates of our arsenals and of our navy yards because they are estimates and not binding bids, is only a method of explanation which permits a great amount of work to be taken from them and given to private builders and individual concerns.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. LETTS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and that in the extension of such remarks I may be permitted to include a radio address which I made on the subject of "Roosevelt and the Navy" on Navy Day, which was the last anniversary of the birth of that great American—Theodore Roosevelt.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The address referred to follows:

Friends of the radio audience, my fellow citizens, this program is in celebration of Navy Day. To-morrow is the birthday of Theodore Roosevelt. To know the great interest which Roosevelt had in the American Navy is convincing that Navy Day is not celebrated on Roosevelt's birthday by accident nor as a coincidence but by design.

The observance of Navy Day carries a message to the American people concerning the importance of sea power and commerce. The business man and the farmer should know how it affects his welfare. His interest in ships should be stimulated, and the matter of building up an American merchant marine should be of general concern.

Theodore Roosevelt was the champion of the American Navy. He was inspired with a great zeal for preparedness. His career was one of great activity along diversified lines. He typified the strenuous life. A devotee of outdoor sports, he was a great hunter and the enemy of nature fakers.

As a statesman he was resourceful and bold in making needed reforms and a leader whom his people delighted to follow. All his life he gave to his country his time, his thought, and, in the highest sense, himself.

As an orator, fluent and convincing, he was the corner of catch phrases and forceful expressions. As a moralist he stood for the square deal. He was an enemy of crooked business and the opponent of race suicide. His life was the expression of idealism in action. Above all he was an enthusiast, an American. Gentle in disposition and refined in character, he was the wielder of the big stick.

Roosevelt dedicated himself to the service of America. He announced the policy that the American Navy should be large enough to enable this country to display its flag in all seas for the protection of its citizens and its extending commerce. He recognized that as a world power our Government had corresponding international rights and duties. He said that the Navy will not provoke war, but that an adequate and trained Navy is the best guaranty against war and the cheapest and most effective peace insurance. It was his conviction that the American people must either build and maintain an adequate Navy or accept a secondary position in international, political, and commercial affairs. A sure way, he said, to invite national disaster is to be opulent, aggressive, and unarmed.

International agreements have done much to curb the size and power of the United States Navy. The number and tonnage of capital ships and cruisers, the caliber of guns, and their elevation have all been at issue. Existing agreements are concerned with sizes, numbers, and quantities. Upon quality no limitation is placed. Respecting such matters as are untouched by these international conventions we should, in the exercise of ordinary prudence and good sense and in accord with national needs, go a very long way in providing ship for ship, gun for gun, and man for man. The fewer ships we have the better they should be, and as for man power, skill, knowledge, and manhood must be par excellence.

Our Navy should be a symbol of our Nation's strength. Our flag in foreign ports a gesture of good will, a display of strength, and the guaranty of our security. It should inspire Americans, at home or abroad, with a great pride of country.

The Navy supplements and supports the labors of diplomacy. It aids peaceful adjustment of international dispute. It is an instrument of wholesome pressure. It sustains peace and promotes prosperity and happiness, which is the true object of government.

The Navy is an index of the character of a nation's commerce. International trade is a mixed matter, involving the question of equipment and of its protection. We can not make a start in international commerce with any amount of equipment without the promise of protection upon the seas and in foreign waters. An adequate Navy alone can guarantee freedom from interruption and molestation.

The Navy was the pioneer in the development of the radio and continues to be an active agent in its progress.

There are three outstanding reasons why we must support an American merchant marine: First, for national defense; second, for the expansion of our foreign trade; and third, to have a voice in the control of ocean freight rates.

Our annual foreign trade amounts to \$10,000,000,000, and the freight bills for transporting it total \$600,000,000. At least one-half of this sum should be turned back for circulation among the people of America. Our prosperity depends on the continued expansion of our industries and our ability to dispose of our surpluses in the markets of the world. Expanding our foreign trade expands our industries, and the greater this expansion the greater our prosperity.

Here in the agricultural region of the country it is our business to plow the soil and reap the crops which are produced by adding mental and physical labor to the resources of nature. It is doubtful whether we fully appreciate how much the prices received for our commodities are influenced by ocean shipping. More than one-sixth of the total products raised on American farms is sold in foreign markets.

For the last several years there has been annually available for export more than 250,000,000 bushels of wheat. Our prosperity rests in a large measure upon the satisfactory disposal of this exportable surplus. The amount of ocean freight which must be paid on this surplus is a controlling thing in the degree of success, which American agriculture can enjoy. As a matter of economic law, the price of the surplus in the world market determines the price in the domestic market. It must be the business of the Government to see that ocean freight rates are reasonable. This can be accomplished only through an adequate and well-conducted merchant marine. It must be protected, and such can only result from the cooperation of a well-trained Navy.

The ships that carry the trade control it. The nation that owns the ships is the master of the markets which it supplies.

During war times American agriculture was greatly expanded because we found it necessary to feed a large part of the world. This increased production is continuing. New and larger markets must be

found for the products of American farms. Such markets can be held and controlled only if America provides ocean-going freighters, rendering service at reasonable rates.

It is well known that there is a difficult farm problem, and there is distress here in the Middle West because of it. But, aside from that condition, ours is the most prosperous of all the nations of the world. Fortunately for us, we are the creditor nation of the world. Our foreign trade equals that of Great Britain and surpasses that of any other nation.

The growth of America and her expanding interests have been attended with increasing obligations. Long ago we adopted a policy known as the Monroe doctrine. By it we assumed a new national duty, which must never fail of performance. South, beyond the waters of the Caribbean Sea, is the Panama Canal. There lie the South American countries. They place full reliance upon our political doctrines.

We do not favor imperialism, but we have, in a most satisfactory and orderly way, acquired important insular possessions, not through the desire for acquisition, but in aid of humane policies. Porto Rico, the Philippine Islands, and Hawaii all rely upon us for that protection which we may not in honor withhold.

There should be a greater pride in our Navy. Our writers of novels and short stories, our poets and our composers of song might well think of America's host of ambitious youngsters and provide them with choice yarns of adventure and sing of our old sea heroes and of our gallant ships of war. The youth of the land should know the Navy as an essential element of our national life, to be loved for what it is. Such attitude would do as much for the Navy as large appropriations by Congress. By literature and art we can sell the Navy to those who have paid for it, but do not yet know what they have got.

No navy can be better than the men who man its ships. There was a time when the Navy offered young men adventure and prize money. To-day it offers them a profession of the most exacting type. It offers opportunities for a career. In manhood, as in materials, the Navy requires the best the Nation affords.

It is fitting, in the discussion of our Nation's armed forces, the development of a national spirit, and the matter of our Nation's material progress, to invite attention to the important influence of naval training and the physical and moral well-being of the young men of America who are connected with the regular service and of the reserve.

The regular Navy takes annually into the active service from 15,000 to 25,000 young men at the formative stage of life. Habits of obedience, cleanliness, and good order are molded into character and ambition. Any young man who has had the privilege of this training is fitted for any struggle for preferment in civil life.

The influence of the Navy on the young manhood of the Nation is augmented by its contact with civil life through Naval Reserve activities. The Naval Reserves have the same relation to the Navy that the National Guard units throughout the country have to the Army. It is the American system, and is contrary to the system of compulsory military service, which is the policy of many continental nations. The American system more nearly meets the ideals of democracy. It avoids the appearance of militarism and yet it makes provision for the security of the Nation in time of emergency.

There are obligations of citizenship as well as its benefits. I am happy to say that the Naval Reserve unit, which sponsors this program to-night, is composed of young men of this community who are rendering to the Nation a service of far-reaching benefit. The service of these young men is the contribution of this community to our Nation's well-being, and evidences a generous and friendly attitude on the part of our people to the great purposes of the American Navy.

There is in the Congress of the United States a big Navy group and a little Navy group. There may be a like division of opinion in the press of the country and in the minds of the general public. It is practical to build an army of volunteers and by conscription. Not so the Navy. Roosevelt understood this and expressed it well when he said, "You can not send volunteers to sea unless you want to send them to the bottom."

May the Navy of the United States exemplify the life and the works of Theodore Roosevelt by always fighting on the side of right.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that all debate has been exhausted.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, I reply to that by saying that the gentleman from Iowa was recognized on a motion to strike out the last word and I am rising in opposition to his motion to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I shall not take more than five minutes of your time because I know you are impatient. I meet the issue that has been made by the gentleman from Iowa, that this is a question of prepared-

ness. I want to call to your attention the fact that the private yards of this country are trembling on the border of absolute dissolution and starvation. Do you know that within the last year a private yard of this country that has been in the business for the last 100 years—Cramps—has gone out of business because it did not have work?

Now, gentlemen, you know that when this great World War came on the private yards of this country constituted Government yards; and it was by reason of the operation of those private yards that you were able to build the bridge of boats that carried your boys and your munitions across the seas and put them in a position to carry on that war.

The question is not whether you shall give this work to a private yard or to a navy yard, but whether you shall leave this discretion in the Navy Department, a discretion that will possibly permit the existence of private yards that otherwise might go out of business.

Another thing I desire to bring to the attention of this committee is the consideration of the absolute necessity of the situation. The gentleman from Illinois has said that an estimate amounts to nothing. I agree with him as to that. There is another consideration, and that is that you have private citizens who have invested their money in organizations built up for the purpose of carrying on the work of this country, of building up your merchant marine, and of helping to build up the Navy. Now, the Government, according to this amendment, would attempt to bring those organizations into such competition as might break them down.

If the officials of the Navy find upon an investigation that the work can be done more cheaply in the navy yard than in the private yards, if they find that the purposes of government can be better subserved by construction in the navy yard than in the private yards, if they find that it is to the interests of the great Government of the United States and of all of its people to construct in the navy yard rather than in the private yards, they have that option, they have that right, they have that discretion. Is it not a reasonable discretion to leave in their hands, allowing them to consider the situation as it exists when the question arises, and thus to work out the problem in such a way as will permit the existence of the private yards of this country and at the same time permit the existence of the navy yards. If your private yards go down, this Congress can not restore them. This Congress has it in its power to preserve the navy yards and to keep them as an organization, and thus it may also preserve and keep in existence the private yards.

The question before you, gentlemen, is a question of preparedness. It is the question of retaining those institutions and those organizations that shall help this country in time of need and stress to meet the dangers of any situation that may arise or confront it. I beg you to vote down the amendment.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate upon this section and all amendments thereto do now close.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BLACK of New York. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLACK of New York. I have an amendment pending and I just want to know whether the motion just adopted will shut off debate on that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. It will. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. DALLINGER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. McMILLAN) there were—ayes 92, noes 78.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. BRITTEN, and the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. DALLINGER.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 102, noes 78.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, if I could understand the wishes of the members of the committee I would be very pleased to express them to the Chair. It seems to be the desire of the committee to read the bill through. I would much prefer to move to rise, but I am not going to go contrary to the wishes of the membership of the committee. To-morrow we can have the roll calls in the House.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUTLER. I will be delighted to yield.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I should like to ask the gentleman from Connecticut, if this bill were finished this afternoon, could the House probably adjourn over to-morrow?

Mr. TILSON. I do not think so, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BUTLER. Let us read the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. BLACK] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLACK of New York: On page 1, strike out lines 5 and 6 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Twenty-five light cruisers to cost, including armor and armament, not to exceed \$17,000,000 each; 9 destroyer leaders to cost, including armor and armament, not to exceed \$5,000,000 each; 32 submarines to cost, including armor and armament, not to exceed \$5,000,000 each; and 5 aircraft carriers to cost, including armor and armament, not to exceed \$19,000,000 each."

Line 7, after the word "five," insert the word "such"; line 10, after the word "one," add the word "such."

Mr. BLACK of New York. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from New York rise?

Mr. BLACK of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a question of personal privilege can not be raised in committee. [Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"]

Mr. BLACK of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak for five minutes in behalf of the President's program.

Mr. ROWBOTTOM. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. BLACK of New York. Mr. Chairman, I demand a division. There is gag rule here and the machine is operating too quickly. I want to see how many Republicans will rise in support of the President's program. I want to see how many of the leaders will vote for it. There is not a one of them.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is out of order.

Mr. BLACK of New York. I know it.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BLACK of New York) there were 8 ayes and 105 noes.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CONNERY. Was that the plan proposed by President Coolidge?

Mr. BLACK of New York. It was.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Navy is directed to submit annually through the Bureau of the Budget estimates for the construction of the foregoing vessels.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 7, after the word "annually," strike out the word "through" and insert the word "to."

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is offered at the instance of the committee, and at the suggestion of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. The word "through" would make it in violation of the Budget law, so the report is to be made to the Budget instead of through the Budget.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 4. In the event of an international agreement for the further limitation of naval armament, to which the United States is signatory, the President is hereby authorized and empowered to suspend in whole or in part any of the naval construction authorized under this act.

Mr. SPOUL of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 14, after the word "agreement," insert a comma and the following words: "The President is hereby directed to encourage."

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, that is not the proper language. It should read "The President is requested to encourage."

Mr. SPOUL of Kansas. I will modify my amendment to that effect.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment as modified.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. SPOUL of Kansas: Page 2, line 14, after the word "agreement," insert a comma and the following words, "The President is requested to encourage."

Mr. BUTLER. We accept that.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk completed the reading of the bill.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 22, strike out the words "ship disasters" and insert in lieu thereof "submarine disasters."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the committee will now rise.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BACON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 11526) to authorize the construction of certain naval vessels, and for other purposes, and had directed him to report the same back with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule the previous question is ordered. Is there a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. BLANTON. I demand a separate vote on the Dallinger amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The other amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment on which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 5, after the word "year," add the following: "And provided further, That the first and each successive alternate cruiser upon which work is undertaken, together with the main engines, armor, and armament for such eight cruisers the construction and manufacture of which is authorized by this act, shall be constructed or manufactured in the Government navy yards, naval gun factories, naval ordnance plants, or arsenals of the United States."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DALLINGER) there were 115 yeas and 102 noes.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The question was taken; and four Members rising, not a sufficient number, the yeas and nays were refused.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I demand the reading of the engrossed bill.

The SPEAKER. Evidently that can not be done.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that to-morrow, after the completion of the bill now under consideration and a bill from the Ways and Means Committee which is privileged, the House proceed to the consideration in the House as in Committee of the Whole of bills on the Private Calendar unobjected to.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. What is the bill from the Committee on Ways and Means?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. It is a bill with reference to the admission of certain cattle. It will not take more than five minutes, I think.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I object to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut.

SPANISH WAR VETERANS

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing therein a resolution which I introduced to-day, and also resolutions adopted by the Worth Bagley Camp, No. 10, Department of Georgia, United Spanish War Veterans.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolutions:

[House Joint Resolution 242, Seventieth Congress, first session]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES,
March 16, 1928.

Mr. EDWARDS introduced the following joint resolution, which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

Joint resolution authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to furnish transportation to certain veterans attending the thirtieth annual encampment of the United Spanish War Veterans to be held at Habana, Cuba, October 7 to 12, inclusive, 1928, at the invitation of the Government of the Republic of Cuba.

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of War is authorized and directed to provide not less than four Army transports of sufficient capacity, and as many more as may be necessary, with ample furnishings and provisions, to convey from the ports of Savannah, New York, New

Orleans, and San Diego to Habana, Cuba, and return such veterans of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps and auxiliary service in the war with Spain and the Porto Rican and Philippine campaigns with proper service credentials as apply for such transportation in order to attend the thirtieth anniversary of the liberation of Cuba, on invitation by the Government of the Republic of Cuba, where the thirtieth annual encampment of United Spanish War Veterans will be held. Such transportation and subsistence shall be free of charge.

Resolutions adopted by Worth Bagley Camp, No. 10, Department of Georgia, United Spanish War Veterans

Whereas the thirtieth annual encampment of the United Spanish War Veterans is to be held at Habana, Cuba, October 7-12, 1928, at the invitation of the Government of Cuba; and

Whereas it is necessary that the veterans and their families who attend this encampment travel by steamer; and

Whereas the port of Savannah, Ga., has splendid railroad connections and other terminal facilities; and

Whereas Savannah has one of the largest camps of the Spanish War Veterans in the South; and

Whereas Savannah was one of the principal ports of embarkation in 1898 and 1899 and the Seventh Army Corps having encamped here for several months make it highly desirable for those comrades to again visit Savannah and view old scenes and renew old acquaintances; and

Whereas the residence of our senior vice commander in chief, William L. Grayson, is located at Savannah, Ga., and the designation of Savannah, Ga., as the port of embarkation would be a compliment to Vice Commander Grayson: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we respectfully petition the committee of arrangements to designate the port of Savannah, Ga., as one of the ports of embarkation for Habana, and we urge the Senators of Georgia and the Congressman from our district, Hon. C. G. EDWARDS, to support the joint resolution offered by Senator GEORGE to furnish governmental water transportation on this occasion, and further that they also use their influence in having Savannah named as one of the ports of embarkation; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be forwarded to the chairman of the water transportation committee, William Jones, of New York, and a copy be furnished the two Senators of Georgia and the Congressman from this congressional district.

VICTOR DESBOUILLONS,

Adjutant Worth Bagley Camp, U. S. W. V.

SAVANNAH, GA., March 9, 1928.

ADDRESS OF HON. FINIS J. GARRETT

Mr. BOYLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing therein an address delivered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] before the Real Estate Board of New York City at the Hotel Commodore, New York City, February 4, 1928.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOYLAN. Mr. Speaker, under the permission granted me to extend my remarks I submit the following speech:

OUR GOVERNMENT

Mr. Toastmaster, ladies, and gentlemen, visible and invisible, you will not be surprised, I am sure, when I tell you that as I look upon this audience and as I look upon the list of speakers with whom temporarily I am thrown that I feel somewhat tremulous and abashed. As I look over the hall, possibly the suggestion comes by reason of the name of the city, possibly it comes by reason of the placards upon which these numbers appear, but somehow there is something reminiscent of the year I spent at the Democratic convention here in 1924. [Applause.]

Now, of course, I know very well that you did not invite me here to talk about real estate. Some years ago I had an invitation to deliver an address in a New England city to the annual meeting of the Iron and Hardware Association, and the gentleman who invited me said, "There are two conditions that we impose upon the speakers whom we invite. One is that they shall not talk partisan politics, because it is not appropriate to the occasion, and the other is that they shall not mention iron or hardware, because if we want a talk about that we will send for somebody who knows something about it. [Laughter.] I obeyed his instructions. I am sure that they must have felt that I gave all that was in me to the occasion, because they have never invited me there any more. [Laughter.]

To be sure, coming from Washington and being a Member of the House, you might expect that I would tell you something of what Congress is doing, and I would except for one thing, and that is that Congress is not doing anything. [Applause.]

I might take you into my confidence—and I know that you and the outside radio listeners will all treat it confidentially—and tell you, since the toastmaster has referred to the work done by a committee of your organization relative to tax reduction, and since, perhaps, some of you have been alarmed about that, I will console you by informing

you that all the indications are that there will be no tax reduction by law at this session of the Congress. The House has done its part. The Committee on Ways and Means brought in a bill and we Democrats took it and made a pretty respectable bill of it in the House, and now they will not report it in the Senate. [Laughter.]

The rumor hath it in Washington that Captain Smoor is unwilling to try and steer the vessel between Scylla Robinson of Arkansas and Charybdis Norris, of Nebraska. [Laughter.] And so, since I can not talk about Congress and can not talk about real estate, the question is, What shall I talk about? I suppose I will simply have to be like Plug Jenkins said his cow was. A gentleman down in my county became very much interested in a good breed of milch cattle, and he collected quite a stock. Plug Jenkins had a milch cow and he wanted to sell it, and he went to this gentleman who was building up this herd of Jerseys and told him that he had a good milch cow that he wanted to sell him, and he said, "I am interested in good stock; what have you, a Jersey?" He said, "No; it is not a Jersey, I don't think." He said, "Is it a Guernsey?" "I don't know; I don't really know what breed that cow is." "Well," he said, "Why do you say she is a good milch cow; does she give lots of milk?" "Well," Plug said, "I want to be honest with you, Tom; I won't say that she gives lots of milk, but she is a good kind of cow and gives all the milk she can." [Laughter.]

With your permission I shall venture to talk to you a few moments about some historical fundamentals of government.

One of the States of our Union has in its constitution the declaration:

"A frequent recurrence to fundamental principles is essential to the preservation of individual liberty."

That is a very fine sentence and it is a fine sentiment. I think that sometimes in the hurly-burly of our busy lives we fail to recall as often as we might the fundamental things upon which our Government rests. Less than 200 years ago, strange as it may seem, when we consider all the developments of all the centuries, the art and the literature, the poetry and the romance in history; these things developed to the most exquisite refinement, yet less than 200 years ago nowhere in the world was there a government of any substantial importance predicated upon the principle of self-government. Upon the contrary through the thread of every governmental institution of importance in all the world there ran the line of the divine right of kings and of class control, the conception that by reason of birth certain individuals held the exclusive right to exercise the executive and the legislative functions in behalf of all mankind.

The striking things of the Declaration of Independence were not those referring to taxation without representation. Struggles over taxation sprinkle all the pages of history. There was nothing new about that. The new thing was that there was for the first time in the history of man formally inserted by a body having the power and the authority to assert it the doctrine that all governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. [Applause.] The sword of Washington made that good. The American Revolutionary War was fought under what was probably the weakest form of civil government ever instituted among men. It had no executive head. It had no judicial branch, and the legislative powers which it assumed to exert were so compassed about with limitations and restrictions as to render the old confederacy practically impotent. It had not the power to levy a single dollar for its own support, nor had it the power to send a single man to arms. As we look back upon it now and observe the tenuousness of its lines, see its weaknesses, the wonder is that under it liberty could have been achieved. But somehow, some way it was done. So weak was this Government that when the treaty of peace was written it was not therein recognized as a sovereign power. But each of the thirteen original States were specifically mentioned by name, and each stood forth among the nations of the earth clad with all the sovereign authority which any nation can possess. Following this Revolution and through the years there sprang up three conditions which necessitated a closer union and a greater central power. Two of these conditions were of a business nature; the third was political. That third we shall mention first. That was the political necessity of forming a Government which was able to protect all of its ports against outside aggression. The two business elements which created the necessity for the formulation of this National Government were: The difficulties growing out of the commerce between States; and, second, the fact that certain of the States, exercising their sovereign power to issue money, had deliberately debased their currency to the point where it had brought universal distress and widespread desolation.

Those three things occasioned the call for the Constitutional Convention issued finally by the Continental Congress, and in May 1787, 55 men, composed of much of the intellectual, moral, and financial aristocracy of America, assembled themselves together in Philadelphia and labored for a period of nearly four months. There was nothing new, my friends, about the idea of a confederacy. All history is filled with tales of leagues and alliances and confederations between sovereign powers, and all history is cluttered with their wrecks. Through the dim and misty corridors of the ages there stroll and swarm the ghosts of innumerable dead confederacies, "the hollow wraiths of broken

fame." The weakness of these confederacies of the past lay in the fact that the governments formed under or by them were not coalitions of their peoples, but combinations of their States. That was the weakness of the very confederacy under which these men were laboring, and because they knew both history and the current law they proceeded to do a new thing in the world.

They proceeded to bring forth a Government which is at once a confederacy and a Nation. It draws its power and holds its authority, not from the States as States but from the people of the States. Its perpetuity, so far as the Constitution is concerned, does not depend upon the whim or caprice or even the intelligent will of the States as States, but upon the wish and the wisdom of the peoples of the States. It exerts its authority, it enforces its decrees not only upon the States as States but upon the people of the States. [Applause.]

And so, for the first time in the history of man, they created a condition under which those then living and those who were to come after were to exist under two distinct forms of government, each sovereign within its sphere. That was the uniqueness of the instrument called the Constitution of the United States. Its greatness lay in two things: First, the nicety with which they divided the powers between the three great bodies, the executive, the legislative, and the judicial; and, second, in the nicety with which they divided powers between the Nation itself and between the States, the people of which composed that Nation. [Applause.] That was the system which these men dreamed and which they put forth, which has come down to us for 140 years. Those men from the wilderness carved out this new thing in the world of men. They, for the first time, gave to democracy, through the means of a Republic, which is the only method by which democracy can be made practical, "a local habitation and a name."

I have sometimes wondered what would happen if overnight these governments of ours could be destroyed, and not only destroyed but all the law books and all the histories that bear account of them wiped from the shelves, and we were suddenly called upon in the morning to bring forth a new form of government. What sort of States, what sort of a nation would we build? It is an interesting speculation, but we do not have to speculate about it. If those men who wrote that Constitution could come here to-night and walk down a single block of this great city, how many things would they see about them concerning which they would have to obtain information from a 10-year-old child? You could hear Washington or Hamilton or Madison or Franklin, the greatest scientist in his day, inquiring, "What is that? What is that I see going by?" Why, that is the automobile. "And what is that I hear?" That is a human voice coming over thousands of miles through what we call the radio. "And what is that I see in the air?" That is the airplane with which man is challenging the eagles for mastery of the empyrean.

Oh, how many things those men would see that would be mysterious and strange to them. But, thank God, they did know how to build States and lay them as the beams of the chamber of a nation. [Applause.] And we have their handiwork as our heritage.

We do not have to speculate about what we would do—we have it. Men coming up out of the wilderness building a nation for 3,000,000 people which has met all the exigencies and the requirements of social evolution and political development until it covers 8 and 40 sovereign States with 120,000,000 of people. We do not have to speculate; all we have to do is to preserve. I think we ought to preserve.

It is as important now to keep separate the legislative and the executive and the judicial branches as it was 140 years ago. [Applause.]

It is as important now as it was in the beginning to maintain with scrupulous fidelity the respective powers and duties of the State and the Nation. [Applause.]

It is trite to say, but it should be said often, nevertheless, that there is too much of bureaucracy. Government by bureaucracy is worse than monarchy. In a monarchy you can at least know who to hang or shoot, but in a bureaucracy, with their divided powers, you can not find the individual upon whom to place responsibility for abuses to freedom and wrongs to liberty.

I do not wish to think of the Republic as a painting upon canvas, the color of which will fade in the sunlight or the fiber of which will rot in the rain. I wish rather to think of it as a great mosaic composed of 8 and 40 imperishable gems, each lustrous with its own local beauty and color, so cemented together with love and law and human reason as to be itself indestructible, however violently human passions may beat against it. [Applause.]

HYDROELECTRIC DEVELOPMENT, SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record on the hydroelectric development in South Carolina.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks on the hydroelectric development in South Carolina I want to call to the attention of the Members of the House and to the citizens of this great Republic the wonderful strides

South Carolina, the State I have the honor to represent in this great lawmaking body, is making.

On January 1, 1927, according to a statement issued by the Federal Power Commission, it was shown that South Carolina had advanced from eighth to fifth place among the States in hydroelectric development.

You remember in a previous Congress I called your attention to the proposal of the building of a very large electric-power plant in Lexington, S. C., my district. I am glad to say to you that this project is a reality now, and when it is completed bids fair of putting South Carolina right around the top as an electric-power State.

South Carolina to-day leads all other States in the manufacturing of cotton. Since the commencement of the building of this tremendous power plant manufacturing concerns of every type are moving into our State.

Why not? If you and your friends want to locate in a section where the climate is ideal the year around, where labor is cheap because of its efficiency, where strikes are unknown, where the taxing powers have given recession to manufacturing interests that want to locate their plants, come to South Carolina.

The following article, written by George Garner, in the Manufacturers Record will be very interesting in connection with the building of this great power project. It deals with the wonderful strides along the above lines in and by the State of South Carolina:

SOUTH CAROLINA'S \$20,000,000 HYDROELECTRIC DEVELOPMENT UNDER WAY—A GREAT ENTERPRISE INDICATIVE OF THE SOUTH'S EXPANSION OF POWER FACILITIES TO SUPPLY ITS GROWING INDUSTRIAL NEEDS

Two thousand men, toiling day and night, except Sunday, week after week, without intermission, are working to complete by 1930 a hydroelectric project on the Saluda River near Columbia and Lexington, S. C., which will cost \$20,000,000, and will constitute one of the greatest waterpower enterprises in the United States and also will embrace some of the largest features in their way of all such construction in all the world. The project is owned by the Lexington Power Co., a subsidiary of the General Gas & Electric Corporation, New York City, of which W. S. Barstow is president, and associated with which are T. C. Williams, of Columbia, originator of the project, and the firm of Murray & Flood, engineers, New York.

No more convincing illustration of the industrial development of the South in the last few years can be found than in this prodigious enterprise. First visioned in 1903 by G. A. Guignard, of Columbia, it remained a fascinating, but only an idle, dream for years, because the South in general and that section in particular provided no adequate industrial market for consumption of the power. Now, so great is the market that not only were contracts signed for sale of the power even before this work was started, but also another project is in prospect in South Carolina which will exceed this in magnitude.

So it is that 2,000 men now are working to complete a project which the designers claim is to become the base-load plant for the superpower system of the Southeast—a plant not only to supply the power needs of its area, but also to reinforce, when needed, the power systems of North Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, Alabama, and Georgia.

As this is written the Saluda River at Dreher Shoals, where the monster plant is to be established, is an unobtrusive stream meandering southeastward through the center of the State, through an area of mixed woodland and farms. On completion of the work it will be the feeder for a lake, of its own creation, 33½ miles in length, 14 miles wide at the broadest point, and twice as large in area as Lake George, in New York State. And in this lake will be impounded 100,000,000,000 cubic feet of water—sufficient to provide a discharge of 5,000 cubic feet a second for half a year even without a drop of inflow. Incidentally, the lake formed by the great Roosevelt Dam in Arizona is 25 miles long and from 1 to 2 miles in width.

For the creation of this lake, an earth dam will be constructed, 206 feet in height and 7,980 feet long, or 1.5 miles. Eleven million cubic yards of earth fill will give it the largest cubical content of any dam in this country, and it is described as the largest earth dam in the world. To build such a dam of concrete, it is explained, would be an economic mistake, as the returns would not nearly measure up to necessary dividends on the investment; so an earth dam will arise, reinforced with an impervious dirt core, fully as substantial, say engineers, as the strongest concrete dam ever constructed. Upstream the slope will be 3 to 1, with a face of riprap, while downstream the slope will be 2½ to 1, with a riprap toe. The maximum head will be 180 feet and the minimum 118 feet, with an average head due to operating schedule of 165 feet.

As construction of the power plant is regarded as a comparatively easy work, that will be held in abeyance until probably the last step in the project. Plans provide for initial installation of four units of 43,500 horsepower each, with an ultimate installation of six units and an aggregate of 261,000 horsepower.

"In effect, 2,600,000 willing, obedient slaves will be put to work, without necessity for feeding them," said Mr. Williams.

And what will be the contribution of this huge plant to the industrial development of the South? It will furnish power for the Broad River Power Co. system, from Union in the north to Denmark in the south, with ramifications through a great territory. It will add thousands of kilowatt-hours of service to the great system of the Southern Power Co., which covers northwest South Carolina and the western half of North Carolina. It will reinforce the power product of the Carolina Power & Light Co., whose system extends from the southeast corner of South Carolina up through the eastern half of North Carolina, and terminates at Danville, Va. Among these three systems will be distributed millions of kilowatt-hours a year from the Saluda River plant, with the Broad River Co. entitled to first call on the supply.

In this great territory already scores of flourishing cities and towns are served, with literally hundreds of plants turning out many varieties of products, and to these will be added scores of other towns and cities to which industrial enterprises will be attracted by abundance of cheap power, abundance of contented and efficient labor, raw materials of many kinds, and ample transportation facilities.

Further than this, it is expected by the promoters of the project that Lake Murray, as the great lake will be known, in time will be bordered with summer resorts and homes, golf courses, and clubhouses. Already reports on investigations by Federal and State health authorities describe the area as extremely healthful, free from fevers, and from disease-breeding mosquitoes. Also, a town is arising near the site and engaging homes for officials of the company already form an attractive nucleus, and, incidentally, it may be said that a church was one of the first structures erected.

In general charge of this great work are the W. S. Barstow Management Association, New York, and Murray & Flood, with A. S. Crane, of the J. G. White Management Corporation, New York, as consulting engineer. Reeves Bros., of Birmingham, Ala., are building the four great pipe lines which first will divert the river from its present course while the dam is constructed and later will connect with the generators, and G. H. Newton, vice president of the concern, has been in personal charge. The contract for excavating for the pipes and incasing them in concrete and for the construction of the dam was awarded to the Arundel Corporation, Baltimore, and the steam shovels and similar machinery are provided by the Anderson Construction Co., Asheville, N. C. Arthur R. Wellwood, of New York, represents Murray & Flood, although W. S. Murray and Henry Flood, Jr., of that firm, are constantly on the spot, and Theodore C. Hamby, of Columbia, is chief assistant to Mr. Wellwood. And of real interest and significance is the fact that in the small regiment composing the engineering force a majority are graduates of southern schools and colleges, such as the University of South Carolina, Clemson University, and the Citadel, Mr. Wellwood having endeavored to utilize South Carolina's young talent wherever possible.

For the construction of this great project it was found necessary first to divert the course of the Saluda River, so that the dam might be thrown up and a core trench be excavated in bedrock for its entire length. Lines were laid for four monster steel pipe lines, each 986 feet long, 16 feet in diameter, and on this part of the work the contractors are busy as this article is written. The soundness of the entire work is well illustrated in this particular feature. In excavations blasted well into bedrock cradles are laid, and on these are placed the lower half circumference of the pipes in 8-foot section lengths. The upper halves then are set and the two are riveted together, with strips riveted to cover the longitudinal seams. Two hundred and twenty-four thousand rivets are needed in this work. On completion the pipe lines, which will be used as penstocks upon completion of the project, will be entirely incased in concrete. At the same time a concrete arch is being constructed parallel with the pipes, 47 feet 7 inches wide and 22 feet 4½ inches high, to supply the two generators which in time will supplement the original four which the pipes will feed. The Arundel Corporation early in February had approximately 500 men on its share of the work, in addition to 2,000 other workers.

At present the work is largely confined to the laying of the pipes and construction of the concrete arch and clearing the lands for construction of the great dam. In obtaining an adequate area for the project, Mr. Williams, for the constructors, was obliged to purchase 122 square miles, including over 600 farms and millions of feet of timber, yet in not one transaction were condemnation proceedings required, "and the sellers still are our friends," said Mr. Williams.

On completion of the pipes and the concrete arch and the diversion of the river's course work will be started on the dam, for which surveys already have been made. For the full length of the dam a trench will be excavated in bedrock and will be filled with fine earth as a base core to prevent seepage. Huge piles of earth then will be thrown up for the dam, and these will be washed down and the fine earth will build up as a core, through which the water will not be able to percolate. The maximum width of the dam at the base will be about a quarter of a mile, and the crown will carry a concrete road over 30 feet wide. The dam will contribute \$7,000,000 to the total cost of \$20,000,000 for the project.

The spillway will be of the gravity section type, with three gates, each 50 by 25 feet, and the head on the crest will be 25 feet.

"This is not a selfish proposition," said Mr. Williams, "for the benefit only of the companies now interested, but is designed, through interconnections, to be of help to others if an emergency should arise."

As an instance of the unexpected mishaps which may occur at any moment, Mr. Williams cited a case in which a heron, flying low, had touched a set of wires with one wing and another set with the tip of the other wing, thus causing a short circuit and cutting light and power from a large industrial community many miles from the power house.

"And so, in event of trouble from low water power or shortage of coal or other plant trouble for any company, the hook-ups can be opened and service be maintained by other systems," Mr. Williams added.

Fully as interesting as observations of the work at present is the background of the project, in which one sees a practical "dreamer" looking forward through the years for conditions to develop which would justify the construction of such a plant. First struck by the possibilities in 1903, Mr. Guignard kept acquiring property at the site till his holdings ran to high figures, and this land he carried for 23 years, with its burden of taxes and loss of interest. So in 1926 he approached Mr. Williams and said he would like to sell the land, and Mr. Williams at once started surveys himself and made borings and soundings and river-flow calculations. Convinced of the value of the proposed project, Mr. Williams laid it before Mr. Murray, whose engineers, after thorough examination of Mr. Williams's figures, reported them accurate and sound, and this report was verified by Mr. Williams himself after long and careful investigation.

Meanwhile, about 1910, Mr. Barstow's interests had acquired a water-power site near at hand, though with much lower head than that acquired from Guignard by Mr. Williams and Mr. Murray. So in this knowledge Mr. Williams and Mr. Murray went to Mr. Barstow to talk business.

"You have one site and we another," said his visitors, in effect; "now, either we will sell ours to you or we will buy yours or we will join forces with you in establishing a great plant."

Mr. Barstow was interested, and after investigation elected to join with Mr. Williams and Mr. Murray in one great enterprise. Great banking concerns, asked to finance the project, sent an expert to look over the ground and on his report undertook the task.

Thus the great enterprise rests on three foundation stones: The vision of Mr. Guignard, the engineering knowledge and business acumen of Mr. Williams, and the faith and enterprise of Mr. Murray and Mr. Barstow.

And even before this project is completed, in 1930, it is expected that an even greater project of the same kind will be well under way in South Carolina, thus further raising the State in horsepower standing among the States of the Union. According to the Federal Water Power Commission, California led all the States in water-power development on January 1, 1927, with New York second, Alabama third, Washington fourth, South Carolina fifth, and North Carolina sixth. South Carolina advanced to its present place from eighth in 1910, and now is said to be supplying about 5 per cent of the total water power of the United States.

THE DALLINGER AMENDMENT TO THE NAVAL CONSTRUCTION BILL

Mr. DOUGLASS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record on the Dallinger amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOUGLASS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, during the debate on the Dallinger amendment to the naval construction bill I tried several times to obtain the floor to indicate why I regarded the enactment of the amendment of my distinguished colleague and esteemed friend, who represents a district adjacent to mine, a most desirable thing, and worthy of the support of every Member of the House, regardless of whether they are in agreement or not with the major feature of the bill itself.

I regard it of supreme importance that we provide for the maintenance and upkeep of our Naval Establishment by keeping as nearly as practicable a completely organized, experienced, and specialized force of tradesmen at the various navy yards at all times. The Government can not expect to obtain the best obtainable staffs of ship fitters, boiler makers, machinists, electricians, coppersmiths, molders, pipe fitters, welders, plumbers, and other mechanical service help in its hour of need at a moment's notice. It requires considerable time, and it is imperative that when a capable and efficient staff of naval vessel workmen are assembled that that organization be kept intact. At present the Navy Department finds it necessary to discharge a large group of navy-yard employees at the completion of every substantial piece of building or repair work, with the result very detrimental to the morale and efficiency of the thousands of tradesmen upon whom the Navy depends to do its ship construction and repairing.

For many years our Naval Establishment did practically all of their own building and overhaul work, but of recent years but little of the actual ship constructing is being done at other than private yards. It has been stated that this change is in the interest of economy. I challenge the soundness of this contention. To the contrary, I find that the change largely has been in the interest of private shipbuilding corporations.

Navy yards, while allowed to bid on ship-construction jobs, are not permitted to submit bids at the actual minimum dollar estimated to do the work, but rather are required to add to their estimates a certain percentage for overhead and depreciation of the yard, dock, and other facilities used in the work.

There is no good reason for the addition of this latter, since the Government is forced to stand the cost of replacement made necessary by deterioration whether the yard facilities and docks are used or not.

It is woeful waste rather than economy to continue the policy of handing out handsome naval-construction plums to private interests when expert, highly specialized staffs of workmen, plus the facilities to do the work, are available at navy yards. I am not an advocate of putting the Government in business as a general scheme, but I do feel that millions of the people's money, necessarily tied up in navy yards, could be saved by putting these facilities to fullest use, rather than allow their deterioration and depreciation while idle.

The Boston Navy Yard, located in my district, was established at a first cost of \$35,600,000, and to realize that only about 25 per cent of this huge investment is being capitalized at the present time is something that should cause everyone with the best interests of the country at heart to think, and to devise means of curtailing this tremendous wasteful expenditure of the public funds. I utterly fail to perceive how anyone can rationally argue that there is economy in turning over to private concerns work that can be done as satisfactorily at our navy yards.

The constructive economical remedy is the providing for, as the Dallinger amendment does, that Congress insist on a fair share of our naval-construction work being allotted to the navy yards. This does not eliminate competitive bidding, which is essential to the proper and legalized awarding of contracts, since all of the navy yards are required to bid against each other for each job. The standard of workmanship, detail, economy in production, and time required for the proper completion of work at the various yards is kept strictly checked by the Navy Department, and in the assignment of jobs the more efficient yards, as they should, are awarded the bigger proportion of the proposed outlay of work.

I am for, and believe every logical, thinking, peace-loving, true American wants, a first-class Army and a first-class Navy, knowing that our continued happiness and security depend on the psychological effect upon the nations of the world of our having an adequate national defense. The Dallinger amendment not alone is helpful in assuring that the Government will have available at all times the most efficient ship-construction personnel, and thus assure our ships being built as skillfully as any that may be built anywhere, but it at the same time is a piece of constructive economy for Uncle Sam.

Incidentally navy-yard employees who have given the best years and efforts of their lives in the Government service should not be subjected to temporary lay offs and oftentimes outright discharges because of the irregularity in assigning work to the navy yards. If all possible work germane to the maintenance and replacement of our Naval Establishment was being done at navy yards, the present serious unemployment situation among the navy-yard workers would not be manifest. We owe it to those faithful and efficient employees who serve in the country's time of need to provide them with stable employment and not merely at intervals when the private shipyards are not able to handle certain of the Government's naval construction work.

FARM RELIEF

Mr. RATHBONE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the agricultural situation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RATHBONE. Mr. Speaker, we have reached a crisis for American agriculture. That means a crisis in the life of the Nation, for the prosperity of the American people must ultimately in large measure rest on the prosperity of the American farmers.

It will not do to blind ourselves to the truth. Never for many years past has there been such deep-seated unrest as exists at the present time. The distress of the farmers of our State and Nation is real, widespread, and far-reaching in its consequences. Already the depression of agriculture has seriously affected the

prosperity of the city and of the entire country. President Green, of the American Federation of Labor, estimated the other day that 5,000,000 men were unemployed. The complaints of business men are heard on all hands.

This is an inevitable outcome of the bad conditions continuing for a period of years among the farmers, who constitute approximately one-third of the population of our country.

The purchasing power of those who till the soil has been so greatly reduced that the market for the products of American industry has been disastrously crippled and curtailed.

Moreover, the influx of population from the country to the city has been steadily going on. This means increased competition among those seeking employment in the cities, resulting in large unemployment. If these conditions are permitted to continue, they can not help but affect most seriously the progress and prosperity of our entire people.

Those who live in the cities, as well as those who dwell on the farm, should realize the great truth that the American eagle can only soar on two wings—industry and agriculture. If our noble national bird is wounded or crippled in one of those wings, it must go fluttering helplessly to the ground. The prosperity of industry and the prosperity of agriculture are one and inseparable.

The Middle West, that great interior section of our country stretching from the Allegheny-Appalachian Mountains on the east to the Rocky Mountains on the west, and from the Gulf of Mexico on the south to our northern boundary, is the center of our agricultural interests and the bread basket of the Nation. In it are produced from 60 to 90 per cent of most of the basic products required for the sustenance of our own people and many millions across the seas. This section, so dependent upon the welfare of agriculture for its development and prosperity, has been an especial sufferer through the distress of agriculture. In population and wealth, outside of a few great cities, this section of our country, in its natural resources the richest of all parts of the United States, has not been keeping pace with the Atlantic and Pacific coasts.

A reapportionment of Congress is certainly not far distant. When this comes it will inevitably result in a relative loss in representation, and therefore in political influence, in Congress and elsewhere of the Middle West.

It is therefore of the utmost importance that some constructive and adequate measure be passed at once and before it is too late the purpose and effect of which will be to place the American farmer on a plane of equal opportunity and prosperity with other classes of our people.

I urge my colleagues to give the utmost consideration to the problem of agriculture, which I believe to be the most momentous that confronts our country to-day. I call upon Congress to rise to meet the situation and to do its utmost to restore the American farmers to the position which they have heretofore so honorably filled in the life and prosperity of this Nation.

THE CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN NAVAL VESSELS

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record upon the pending bill and to incorporate also a short letter published in the Washington Post on the Bacon antipilotage bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I desire to extend my remarks on this bill for the reason that I will not be able to vote upon it to-morrow—Saturday—as a matter of great importance will call me away from Washington. The engagement was made several days ago, and it is utterly impossible for me to break it at this time. Of course, nine out of ten Members of the House believed that we would pass this bill as amended before we adjourned this—Friday—evening.

I am glad to say that I voted for the Dallinger amendment, which is a part of the bill, and can not be eliminated therefrom, as on the separate vote taken in the House before adjournment that amendment was adhered to by the majority of the House.

I have always believed in our country having an adequate Army and an adequate Navy. To be without either from a standpoint of national defense is about as foolish as it would be for a great city like New York to be without a police department or a fire establishment. Elaboration in this case would only be the work of supererogation. I feel though that proper naval survey should be made of the whole naval situation and a thoroughly scientific system, both with respect to the character of the naval equipment we should have and the location of the shore stations, so that they might be able to render the greatest possible service when on some tremendous day the country will have to call all of them into action. The country

is at a loss right now, or rather in a mental fog, as to whether it is advisable to continue building battleships, cruisers, and destroyers or to give thought and effort and action to the building of submarines and airplanes. Most men who have given the matter any thought whatsoever believe that the navy yards and arsenals and other shore establishments are not so geographically situated so as to make for a real service in case of a naval engagement with any trans-Atlantic power. As a matter of fact, the logic of the statement made by Mr. MADDEN, chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, and the statement made by Mr. BUTLER, chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee, with respect to the Dallinger amendment lead unerringly to the conclusion that the navy yards in Boston, Brooklyn, and Philadelphia, which are the major ones, ought to be abandoned.

Both these gentlemen substantially stated that it would cost, if the Dallinger amendment were adopted, a million dollars each more per vessel than if they were built in private shipyards. If the building of ships is more costly in the navy yards than in private yards, then the repair of ships is more costly in navy yards than in private yards. That conclusion follows as the night does the day. But with all due deference to these two well-informed gentlemen who are the chairmen of two of the most important and powerful committees of the House, I feel that they are probably mistaken as to the facts upon which they have founded such a judgment.

I believe in a first-class navy, and feel that the American people want one. What is a first-class navy should not be so hard to determine. I am reminded in this connection of an expression used by a well-known Member of the House some years ago who stated that a second-class navy was like a second-class poker hand. They both would lead to the destruction of their possessor. This statement I need not elaborate either as the truth of it is obvious.

Inasmuch as ocean and river pilotage are absolutely essential to the safety to naval and commercial vessels, I feel that, as a matter of information, it is my duty to incorporate and make a part of these remarks a letter which appeared in the Washington Post under date of March 14, 1928. The judgment of the writer of that letter is so fundamentally sound and his views so clearly and convincingly expressed that I feel I can without hesitation commend them to the thoughtful consideration of those who will do me the honor to read these remarks:

[From the Washington Post, March 14, 1928]

THE BACON ANTIPILOTAGE BILL

TO THE EDITOR OF THE POST:

SIR: With reference to the above subject, permit me to suggest that this is a matter which should be considered thoroughly from more angles than one.

Owners of vessels and cargoes can be compensated for their loss in dollars and cents by the insurance companies who carry their risks, but human life can not be restored nor justly compensated for through lack of a pilot who is a specialist in preventing disasters to shipping, and to cargoes and passengers who happen to be on board the vessel.

Maryland has on its statute books a law exempting American vessels from the services of a pilot, but it is as dead as old King Tut, and why? Because the first and only vessel that took advantage of this law was lost with its entire cargo in Chesapeake Bay. The facts are, the bark *Pettingill* was towed from Baltimore, Md., without employing a pilot and was anchored by the tugboat on the north side of the Horse Shoe to await favorable conditions for proceeding to sea. A terrific northeast storm arose and swept the *Pettingill* onto the Horse Shoe, and in going across this shoal the heavily laden vessel foundered and became a total wreck—not a trace ever being found of her crew of 14 men, who were, of course, drowned like rats.

If the *Pettingill* had been under the skillful guidance of a pilot, she would have been anchored on the south side of the Horse Shoe, where the bottom is better holding ground, and she would have undoubtedly ridden safely through the gale, but the lives of these 14 seamen were ruthlessly sacrificed to ignorance and greed.

If the Bacon bill is passed, it will most certainly invite retaliation by the countries among the "favored nations," and American shipowners laboring under handicaps and discrimination at foreign ports may naturally expect to encounter still more.

Pilotage is a part of the police powers of the State and has frequently been dealt with by many high judicial bodies both in this and foreign countries, Judge Curtis having said:

"It is local and not national, and it is likely to be best provided for not by one system or plan of regulation but by as many as the legislative discretion of the several States deem applicable to the local peculiarities of the ports within their limits."

It is therefore plainly a matter for State and not National legislation, and I may add that it is looking for a little too much of the American master when we expect him to have an intimate knowledge of the dangerous currents and shoals of every port he has to enter.

I therefore trust that Congress will consider human life of more moment than the dollar and leave the regulation of pilots to the State, where it rightfully belongs.

ALBERT S. J. JAKEMAN.

RICHMOND, VA., March 10.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to—

Mr. GALLIVAN, for five days, on account of official business in connection with the celebration of the evacuation of Boston by the British in 1776.

Mr. BULWINKLE, for 10 days, on account of personal and private business.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred to the appropriate committee, as follows:

S. 374. An act for the relief of Lulu Chaplin; to the Committee on War Claims.

S. 511. An act to reimburse Horace A. Choumard, chaplain in Twenty-third Infantry, for loss of certain personal property; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 757. An act to extend the benefits of certain acts of Congress to the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 777. An act making eligible for retirement, under certain conditions, officers and former officers of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps of the United States, other than officers of the Regular Army, Navy, or Marine Corps, who incurred physical disability in line of duty while in the service of the United States during the World War; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

S. 1628. An act relating to the office of Public Buildings and Public Parks of the National Capital; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1763. An act for the relief of the Sunny Brook Distillery Co.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

S. 2900. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 49 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, March 17, 1928, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. TILSON submitted the following tentative list of committee hearings scheduled for Saturday, March 17, 1928, as reported to the floor leader by clerks of the several committees:

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

(10.30 a. m.)

Legislative appropriation bill.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

(10 a. m.)

Authorizing additional employees for the Federal Power Commission (H. R. 8141).

COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

(1.30 p. m.)

To safeguard national defense; to authorize, in the aid of agriculture, research, experiments, and demonstration in methods of manufacture and production of nitrates and ingredients comprising concentrated fertilizer and its use on farms (H. R. 10028).

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

(10.30 a. m.)

To prohibit the exportation of arms, munitions, or implements of war to belligerent nations (H. J. Res. 183).

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

409. Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting report from the Chief of Engineers on preliminary examination of Danvers River, Mass., was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. WILLIAMSON: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 5574. A bill authorizing the Lower Spokane and the Lower Pend o'Reille or Lower Calispell Tribes or Bands of Indians of the State of Washington, or any of them, to present their claims to the Court of Claims; without amendment (Rept. No. 958). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. PARKER: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 7191. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to convey certain land in Cook County, Ill., to the Chicago & Western Indiana Railroad Co., its successors or assigns, under certain conditions; without amendment (Rept. No. 959). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WINTER: Committee on Mines and Mining. H. R. 11411. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to provide relief in cases of contracts connected with the prosecution of the war, and for other purposes," approved March 2, 1919, as amended; with amendment (Rept. No. 961). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LUCE: Committee on the Library. H. R. 7475. A bill to provide for the removal of the Confederate monument and tablets from Greenlawn Cemetery to Garfield Park; without amendment (Rept. No. 965). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. McLEOD: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 9782. A bill to amend the Code of Law for the District of Columbia so as to empower the corporation counsel for the District of Columbia and his assistants to administer oaths; without amendment (Rept. No. 967). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. McLEOD: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 1279. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to compromise and settle certain suits at law resulting from the subsidence of First Street east, in the District of Columbia, occasioned by the construction of a railroad tunnel under said street; without amendment (Rept. No. 968). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. YON: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 9789. A bill for the relief of Sallie E. McQueen and Janie McQueen Parker; with amendment (Rept. No. 960). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HUGHES: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 9721. A bill for the relief of Willie G. Chapman; without amendment (Rept. No. 962). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WURZBACH: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 10472. A bill to authorize the appointment of Master Sergt. August J. Mack as a warrant officer, United States Army; without amendment (Rept. No. 963). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mrs. LANGLEY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 10067. A bill for the relief of Marion Banta; without amendment (Rept. No. 964). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McLEOD: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 7722. A bill authorizing the health officer of the District of Columbia to issue a permit for the opening of the grave containing the remains of the late Nellie Richards; without amendment (Rept. No. 966). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii: A bill (H. R. 12135) authorizing an appropriation to continue the proceedings for the acquisition by the United States of private rights of fishery in and about Pearl Harbor, Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12136) authorizing the Secretary of War to pay officers and men of Company G, Third Infantry, Hawaii National Guard, for armory drill during the period of January 1, 1917, to June 30, 1917; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. ZIHLMAN: A bill (H. R. 12137) to provide a temporary location for a farmers' market site in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND: A bill (H. R. 12138) granting abandoned public building and grounds at Sitka, Alaska, to the Ter-

territory of Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ROY G. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 12139) making eligible for retirement, under certain conditions, officers and former officers of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps of the United States, other than officers of the Regular Army, Navy, or Marine Corps, who incurred physical disability in line of duty while in the service of the United States during the World War; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. ZIHLMAN: A bill (H. R. 12140) to aid the University of Maryland in the instruction of students of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. EDWARDS: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 242) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to furnish transportation to certain veterans attending the thirtieth annual encampment of the United Spanish War Veterans to be held at Habana, Cuba, October 7 to 12, inclusive, 1928, at the invitation of the Government of the Republic of Cuba; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Iowa, memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass at this session effective agricultural surplus control legislation as embodied in the McNary bill in the Senate and the Haugen bill in the House, each containing the equalization fee; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also memorial of the Legislature of the State of Iowa, memorializing the Congress to pass such legislation and make such appropriation as is necessary to continue to carry on most efficiently and effectively the work of the combating of the European corn borer and preventing its spread throughout the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GARBER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Indiana, requesting Congress to prepare, support, and secure the enactment of legislation limiting and defining the jurisdiction of the United States courts in public utility and rate cases to the consideration after, not before, the courts of various States have considered the issue involved; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ARENTZ: A bill (H. R. 12141) granting a pension to Lucy M. Mayett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12142) granting a pension to Ellen T. Richey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ARNOLD: A bill (H. R. 12143) granting an increase of pension to Celia A. Hackett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BYRNS: A bill (H. R. 12144) for the relief of Sam Perkins; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CHASE: A bill (H. R. 12145) for the relief of Second Cook Victor Gray, United States Navy; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COHEN: A bill (H. R. 12146) to reinstate Winston W. Ehrigott in the United States Military Academy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ELLIOTT: A bill (H. R. 12147) granting a pension to Emma L. Coon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 12148) granting an increase of pension to Cornelia C. Hammond; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUDSPETH: A bill (H. R. 12149) granting a pension to William T. Hancock; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12150) granting a pension to J. T. Wood; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12151) granting a pension to Elisha Wilson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12152) granting a pension to Benjamin M. Stradley; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HUGHES: A bill (H. R. 12153) granting a pension to John Henry Blackburn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOZIER: A bill (H. R. 12154) granting an increase of pension to Anna Kistler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MANLOVE: A bill (H. R. 12155) granting a pension to Thomas A. Heard; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MAJOR of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 12156) granting an increase of pension to Margaret N. Gordon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OLDFIELD: A bill (H. R. 12157) granting a pension to Claud L. Chappelle; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. QUAYLE: A bill (H. R. 12158) for the relief of Annie O'Neill; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REID of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 12159) granting a pension to Frances E. Covel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RATHBONE: A bill (H. R. 12160) granting an increase of pension to Josiah L. Albritton; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SCHNEIDER: A bill (H. R. 12161) granting an increase of pension to Ira D. Bryant; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SWICK: A bill (H. R. 12162) granting an increase of pension to Martha A. Richey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12163) granting an increase of pension to Jane Snyder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12164) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth G. Garvin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THURSTON: A bill (H. R. 12165) granting an increase of pension to Catherine J. Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WARE: A bill (H. R. 12166) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Watson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WELSH of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 12167) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRAHAM: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 241) authorizing the award of a medal of honor to Dr. William E. Ashton; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5452. Resolution of the Bar Association of the District of Columbia, March 13, 1928, recording itself as having full and complete confidence in the integrity and efficiency of Edwin B. Hesse, major and superintendent of police of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

5453. By Mr. BLOOM: Petition of Bronx Chamber of Commerce, for world's fair to be held in New York in celebration of George Washington's two hundredth birthday anniversary; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5454. Also, petition of Mrs. L. E. Speer, of 242 DeKalb Avenue, Brooklyn, N. Y., and petitions of 1,702 other citizens of New York, protesting against House bill 78, for Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

5455. By Mr. CRAMTON: Petition signed by Charles C. Chamberlin and nine other residents of Romeo, Mich., expressing opposition to House bill 10022 and Senate bill 2806, the so-called corn sugar bills; to the Committee on Agriculture.

5456. By Mr. DAVENPORT: Petition of Emerson G. Biel and other citizens of New York State, protesting against the enactment into law of House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

5457. By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of P. B. Heintz, president National Casket Co., 60 Massachusetts Avenue, Boston, Mass., recommending favorable consideration of the bill introduced by Congressman Newtron, of Minnesota, declaring the right of the American consumer to combine in the purchase of commodities, such as rubber, potash, etc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5458. By Mr. GARBER: Letter of Mrs. M. Helema, 1224 West Oklahoma, Enid, Okla., in protest to the enactment of Senate bill 3107; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

5459. Also, letter of Gertrude Toepfer, of Kingfisher, Okla., in protest to the enactment of Senate bill 3107; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

5460. Also, letter of Highway Association No. 77, by Roy M. Johnson, chairman, and Blanche Mason, secretary, of Gainesville, Tex., in support of House bill 10142; to the Committee on Roads.

5461. Also, letter of F. H. Fowler, civil engineer of San Francisco, Calif., in support of House bill 8111, providing for an inventory of the water resources of the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5462. Also, petition of residents of Alva, Okla., in support of legislation for Civil War veterans and widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

5463. Also, petition of residents of Garfield County, in protest to the enactment of House bill 78 for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

5464. By Mr. HALL of North Dakota: Petition of Community Club of Valley City, N. Dak., against the enactment of

the Oddie bill, having to do with the Government furnishing stamped envelopes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

5465. Also, petition of eight citizens living in LaMoure County, N. Dak., against the enactment of House bill 78, or any other compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

5466. Also, petition of nine citizens living in La Moure County, N. Dak., against the enactment of House bill 78, or any other compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

5467. By Mr. HAUGEN: Petition of 30 members of Oelwein Women's Civic Club, Oelwein, Iowa, against the further postponement, amendment, or repeal of the national-origins provision of the restrictive immigration act of 1924; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

5468. Also, petition of 29 members of Elkader Women's Club, Elkader, Iowa, against the further postponement, amendment, or repeal of the national-origins provision of the restrictive immigration act of 1924; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

5469. By Mr. HAWLEY: Petition of residents of Millwood, Oreg., favoring passage of legislation to increase the pensions of Civil War veterans and their dependents; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

5470. Also, petition of residents of Bandon, Oreg., and Washington County, Oreg., opposing the passage of House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

5471. By Mr. HOOPER: Petition of George W. Lindref and 46 other residents of Eaton Rapids, Mich., protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

5472. By Mr. HUDSPETH: Petition of residents of El Paso, Tex., against the Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

5473. By Mrs. KAHN: Petition of numerous citizens of California, protesting against the Brookhart motion picture bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5474. Also, petition of members of Federal Employees' Union, No. 1, San Francisco, Calif., urging action on House bills 25, 492, and 6518; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

5475. By Mr. JOHNSON, of Washington: Petition of Grays Harbor County, Wash., protesting against the Lankford Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

5476. By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of American Library Association, Chicago, Ill., urging favorable action on House bill 8304 and the reduction of postal rates on books; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

5477. By Mr. MILLER: Petition of citizens of Bremerton, Wash., protesting passage of House bill 78, District of Columbia Sunday closing bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

5478. By Mr. O'BRIEN: Petition of citizens of Harrison and Taylor Counties, W. Va., opposing the Lankford bill (H. R. 78); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

5479. By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of George Mead, recording secretary of machinists, National Lodge, No. 556, International Association of Machinists, Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring the Dallinger amendment to the naval authorization bill; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

5480. Also, petition of Joseph N. Ward, secretary Electrical Union, Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring the Dallinger amendment to the naval authorization bill; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

5481. Also, petition of the American Library Association, Chicago, Ill., favoring the passage of the Luce bill (H. R. 8304) and Copeland bill (S. 2040); also favoring the incorporation of the provisions of the two bills in the general postal rate bill (H. R. 9296), which is now under consideration; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

5482. Also, petition of John McMurray, secretary Metal Trades Council, of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring Dallinger amendment to the naval authorization bill; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

5483. Also, petition of James C. Quinn, secretary Central Trades and Labor Council, New York City, favoring the Dallinger amendment to the naval authorization bill; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

5484. Also, petition of International Association of Machinists, Washington, D. C., favoring the Dallinger amendment to the naval authorization bill; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

5485. By Mr. QUAYLE: Petition of the Merchants' Association of New York, favoring the passage of House bill 9195; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5486. Also, petition of R. H. Hooper & Co., New York City, with reference to legislation now pending in Congress which

would practically put all American cotton exchanges out of business; to the Committee on Agriculture.

5487. Also, position of the National Foreign Trade Council, favoring the passage of House bill 9195; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5488. By Mr. ROMJUE: Petition of Ervin Reese, R. E. Hoffman, et al., of Novinger, Mo., for passage of Civil War pension bill carrying the rates proposed by the National Tribune; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

5489. By Mr. SINNOTT: Petition of a large number of citizens of Klamath County, Oreg., protesting against enactment of House bill 78, the Lankford bill, or any similar compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

5490. By Mr. THATCHER: Petition of numerous citizens of Louisville, Ky., protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

5491. By Mr. THURSTON: Petition of 15 citizens of Sharpsburg, Iowa, and vicinity, protesting against the passage of House bill 78, or the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SATURDAY, *March 17, 1928*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We are deeply grateful, our Father of mercies, for the witness and leaders of Thy holy truth, who have recovered the broken purposes of men and their faltering faith and led them forth into the promised land of a blessed assurance. They have lighted the higher ideals on the altars of their souls. They flung aside as unworthy of reckoning the trials of earth and brought release, convoy, and guidance homeward. We praise Thee for the chivalry of soul and boundless faith of Ireland's patron saint. His mission and message, his character and life have become the inspiration of countless numbers who are now walking in the pathway of the Master. Inspire our humble lives with the same immovable conviction, fortitude, and sacrifice, that we, too, may hold aloft the threefold torchlight of faith, hope, and love. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. CAMPBELL, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the following title, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 10286. An act making appropriations for the military and nonmilitary activities of the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1929, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 2007. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to pay officers and Filipinos formerly enlisted as members of the National Guard of Hawaii for field and armory training during years 1924 and 1925, and to validate payments for such training heretofore made;

S. 2021. An act extending and continuing to January 12, 1930, the provisions of "An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to determine and confirm by patent in the nature of a deed of quitclaim the title to lots in the city of Pensacola, Fla.," approved January 12, 1925; and

S. 2800. An act authorizing E. K. Morse, his heirs and legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Delaware River at or near Burlington, N. J.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I have a resolution to present from the Committee on Rules.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, in order that the order of business of the day may be known as early as possible, I now renew my request of yesterday, that upon the completion of the bill from the Committee on Ways and Means, which is privileged, and after the consideration of a little resolution from the Committee on Rules, the House as in Committee of the Whole